

11
75
A.21
14
V.39
NO. 10
CASE-
\$4800-
. Small
ed per-
ity and
FSAA
ing con-
ey, Di-
s Serv-
, Ind.

begin-
n with
-\$6000.
multiple-
s field
Univer-
nsulta-
Bureau,

AF-
VIL
IT-
cial
one
ning
are
ilies
res-
the
also
ron-
op-
itia-
and
pro-
start
25%
g al-
rite
Bu-
ash-
ap-
onal

Journal
of the
Child Welfare League
of America
Inc.

DE
SOCIAL WORK

child welfare

December 1960

The Economy of Adequate Service

Cottage Parents in a Treatment In-
stitution

The Interstate Compact on the Place-
ment of Children

An Agency Cleans House

Negro Adoptions—Challenge Ac-
cepted

Child Welfare as a Field of Social
Work Practice: A Discussion

CHILD WELFARE

JOURNAL OF THE
CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, Inc.

Editorial Consultant: Isabel Johnson
Editorial Assistant: Judith Hilfer

CHILD WELFARE is a forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems and the programs and skills needed to solve them. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

CONTENTS

	Page
The Economy of Adequate Service	1
By James R. Dumpson	
Cottage Parents in a Treatment Institution	7
By James F. Berwald, M.D.	
The Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children	11
By Harold Hagen	
An Agency Cleans House	18
By Joseph E. Paull	
Negro Adoptions—Challenge Accepted	22
By Mildred Hawkins	
Child Welfare as a Field of Social Work Practice: A Discussion	29
Comments by James R. Dumpson, Rev. Swithun Bowers, O.M.I., Norris E. Class	
Readers' Forum	33
Book Notes	34
Classified Personnel Openings	35

Editorial and general office:
345 E. 46th Street, N. Y. 17, N. Y.
Published monthly except August and September by the
Child Welfare League of America, Inc.
Annual Subscription, \$4.00
3-Year Subscription, \$10.00
Individual Copies, 45 cents
Student Rates—Annual Subscription, \$2.75
2-Year Student Subscription, \$5.00

Copyright, Child Welfare League of America, Inc., 1960

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 52-4649

VOL. XXXIX

No. 10

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Officers

MRS. RICHARD J. BERNHARD, *Pres.*, New York, N. Y.
MRS. HERBERT F. FISHER, *First Pres.*, Hartford, Conn.
LEONARD W. MAYO, *Vis. Pres.*, New York, N. Y.
DR. JULIA S. B. RICHMOND, *Vis. Pres.*, Syracuse, N. Y.
RT. REV. MSGR. JOSEPH P. SPRINGER, *Vis. Pres.*, Milwaukee, Wis.
MRS. JUAN T. TRIPPLE, *Vis. Pres.*, New York, N. Y.
ALAN S. GLISMER, *Secy.*, Cleveland, Ohio
THOMAS M. PETERS, *Vis. Pres.*, Morristown, N. J.

Board of Directors

HON. ELMER L. ANDERSEN, St. Paul, Minn.
MILDRED E. BELL, Portland, Ore.
LOUIS L. BENNETT, New York, N. Y.
JUDGE JANE M. BOBIN, New York, N. Y.
MRS. SARAH R. CALDWELL, Jackson, Miss.
FRANCIS F. CARMODY, New York, N. Y.
R. H. COLLEGATE, Cleveland, Ohio.
ROBERT E. DILTON, Buffalo, N. Y.
DR. MARIEA M. ELLIOT, Boston, Mass.
MRS. LAWRENCE S. FELICIANI, Piedmont, Calif.
CLYDE GELZ, Los Angeles, Calif.
CARL W. HAFENKRIEGER, Providence, R. I.
MRS. BEN W. HENIMAN, Chicago, Ill.
W. O. HENZEL, New York, N. Y.
MRS. KATE B. HELMS, Charlottesville, Va.
E. T. HERMANN, San Rafael, Calif.
MRS. LINDSAY HOBBS, Milwaukee, Wis.
MRS. ROY A. HUNT, Jr., Pittsburgh, Pa.
THEODORE A. JONES, Chicago, Ill.
ROBERT M. LANDIS, Philadelphia, Pa.
MRS. MARY LAWRENCE, Chicago, Ill.
JUDGE HARRY W. LINDENMAYER, Newark, N. J.
MRS. WILLIAM K. LYON, Dover, Del.
HAROLD T. PATTERSON, Atlanta, Ga.
PAUL W. PHILLIPS, Fort Wayne, Ind.
JACK N. Pritzker, Chicago, Ill.
EDWIN J. PUZZIOL, Jr., St. Louis, Mo.
MRS. ALEXANDER RIPLEY, Los Angeles, Calif.
MRS. GARDNER SYMONDS, Houston, Texas.
JOHN G. THIBUR, Washington, D. C.
B. A. TOMPKINS, New York, N. Y.
FRANKLIN W. WALLIN, Jenison, Mich.
DR. ELLEN WINSTON, Raleigh, N. C.

JOSEPH H. REED, *Executive Dir.*
HELEN R. HAGAN, *Asst. Exec. Dir.*

COMMITTEES ON PUBLICATIONS AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

JOHN G. THIBUR, *Chairman*
Executive Secretary
Family and Child Services of Washington, D. C.

Policy Committee

Advisory Committee

MARY C. DALY
Director, Department of Children, Catholic Charities of St. Louis, St. Louis, Mo.

BALDWIN F. GAUCHAN
General Case Supervisor, Division of Child Welfare, Department of Social Welfare, Rochester, N. Y.

DOROTHY GILES
Director, Children's Service, The New England Home for Little Wanderers, Boston, Mass.

IAN GREGORY
Executive Secretary, The Greenwich Center for Child and Family Service, Greenwich, Conn.

MRS. ERIC HAIGHT
Board Member, The Spencer-Chapin Adoption Service, New York, N. Y.

ADELMAR KAISSER
Director, Hillside Children's Center, Rochester, N. Y.

ELIZABETH G. MEIER
Associate Professor, New York School of Social Work, New York, N. Y.

ROBERT F. OTT
Director, Division of Child Guardianship, State Department of Welfare, Boston, Mass.

AMELIA STERNAY
Director, Child Adoption Service of the State Charities Aid Association, New York, N. Y.

ELIZABETH S. TOWNSEND
Executive Director, Children's Bureau of Delaware, Wilmington, Delaware

HAROLD N. WINER
Executive Director, National Publicity Council, New York, N. Y.

MRS. ALAN WINER
Board Member, Association for Jewish Children of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa.

THE
James
Commission
City of M

As one
welfare,
swell of
and fund
finds also
response
absence
services
selves an
delinquen
many qu

These
in conflict
children
observing
the human
tion of g
tion. Wh
as a neg
disregard
an atmos
destroy
of childr

For m
commitm
accept re
placed th
our own
ology for
their fam
terials o
care, the
home fin
of childr
have de
child's o
parents
adequate
viction t

Importa
We ha
that a c
strength

CHILD

THE ECONOMY OF ADEQUATE SERVICE

James R. Dumbson

Commissioner of Welfare
City of New York

Children can't wait. It is both good economy and sound social welfare to provide adequate services for children at the time they need them.

As one assesses the state of affairs in social welfare, one must recognize a growing ground-swell of rejection across the land of the basic and fundamental provisions for children. One finds also an eye-for-an-eye, punitive kind of response ready for children who through the absence of the health-giving experiences and services they need are in conflict with themselves and the community. Dependent and delinquent children are viewed as liabilities in many quarters.

These rejections and punitive responses are in conflict with our national avowal that our children are our greatest asset. Maybe we are observing not so much conflict in values about the human welfare of our children as a reflection of general value bewilderment in the nation. Whatever the cause, this must be defined as a negative approach to children—a callous disregard for their needs. It reflects, I believe, an atmosphere and attitude that may well destroy the advances already won in behalf of children.

For much of this situation, we who profess commitment to child and family welfare must accept responsibility. For too long, we have placed the major part of our concern within our own councils on techniques and methodology for reversing pathology in children and their families. Our literature is rich with materials on the professional content of foster care, the meaning and handling of separation, home finding, adoption, psychiatric disorders of children. It is only quite recently that we have determined to find ways to secure a child's own home for him, to assure for him parents who are able and willing to provide adequate care, and to institutionalize our conviction that this is right.

Importance of a Family to the Child

We have known and believed for a long time that a child's welfare is served best by first strengthening and sustaining his own family.

The redefinition of child welfare services suggested by the Federal Advisory Council on Child Welfare Services reaffirms this fundamental objective.¹ The significance of that statement lies in its emphasis upon the enlargement of the purposes of child welfare services, particularly in relation to prevention. The arena of our concern is inevitably the child within the family.

We begin from the belief we hold in common, that *wherever possible* it is better for a child (and for his parents and the community of which they are a part) to be brought up by his natural parents than in foster care facilities of any kind. We know that despite the seriousness of the family situation from which a child might come, it is in his mind always *his* family. Each day in our practice we see the elasticity of the child's relationship with his parents, which often becomes stronger when he is removed than when he is at home with them. The re-definition of child welfare services which I have mentioned contains the provision for increasing efforts to maintain that child at home.

When a child must be in placement, our obligation is two-fold—to provide him with the best possible environment for his continued growth and development, and to sustain all our efforts to help him back to real family life, whether this be with his natural parents or with permanent adoptive parents. Once we accept the notion that placement is at best substitute care, though it be the finest of such care, we must continually expand our conception of child welfare services to include, *wherever possible*, the family of the child. Child welfare programs are properly becoming family-focused. Our lasting help to the child is dependent on our help to his family, the natural one or the permanent substitute we provide for him. We cannot separate child and

¹ See *Report of the Advisory Council on Child Welfare Services*, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., December 28, 1959.

family; and those who do so, do so in folly and serious error.

An Atmosphere of Misunderstanding

But I suggest that misunderstanding is widespread about needs and rights of children and the needs and rights of parents. Out of this misunderstanding and confusion among many well-intentioned people has developed an atmosphere that makes possible the public reactions, for example, to our basic national child welfare program—Aid to Dependent Children.

If the needs of children in their own families were truly understood and there were unequivocal acceptance of our responsibility to meet them, I doubt that it would be possible for a bill to be introduced in the legislature of one of our states to deny assistance to a mother and her out-of-wedlock child in need because she has already had one out-of-wedlock child, or until proof, satisfactory to the Welfare Board, has been presented showing that the mother has ceased illicit relationships and is maintaining "a suitable home" for the children. If the needs of children in their own homes were truly understood, that state would not have enacted legislation to cease recognizing common-law marriages, thus dropping from the assistance rolls four thousand cases involving mothers and children. States would not seek to deny aid to any child born out of wedlock or to an entire family when an out-of-wedlock birth occurs or has occurred in the family. One state, reflecting the extent of its confusion and punitive drive in dealing with the problem, proposed psychiatric treatment for the mother of a child born out of wedlock. If there were a second such birth, the mother would be sterilized.

Attacks on ADC

Earlier, I referred to the state of value bewilderment we may be experiencing in approaching the care of children and families. I submit that the attacks on the one nationally supported program designed to implement the philosophy we have about the basic needs of children in their own families reflect not only our value bewilderment, but a social atmosphere that allows rejection of people in need whether they are adults or children.

It seems to me that our leadership in bringing into the open the issues that are involved in the attacks on the ADC program is long overdue. In this way we may also place the focus on community attitudes about people in need. Let me make clear that I agree that there are weaknesses in the ADC program; but we need not, indeed dare not, eliminate or destroy the program as the only way of dealing with the weaknesses. Rejection of the underlying philosophy of ADC will result in destruction of the one Federal program designed to sustain family life.²

It took us until 1935 to recognize that the degrading and penalizing features of the various publicly aided programs for dependent children were a travesty on what we knew children needed and were entitled to. Successive White House Conferences on Children, beginning with the one in 1909, stimulated us to put into program and practice what we had learned about children's need. And so, in 1935, we enacted the ADC program as a social welfare resource to provide financial assistance and services to children in their own homes and in the homes of relatives. We gave legal sanction to the granting of assistance to enable children in need, deprived of parental support and care, to have the economic aid and services required for their healthy development in their own family setting. In 1956, the mandate was broadened to include provision for services

"to needy dependent children and the parents and relatives with whom they are living to help maintain and strengthen family life and to help such parents or relatives to attain the maximum support and personal independence consistent with the maintenance of continuing parental care and protection."

Confusing Cause and Effect

In the midst of enacting the highly significant 1956 amendment, large and significant sectors of the nation began to confuse cause with effect in viewing this basic family and child welfare service. I submit that the virulent attacks on the ADC program across the

² Two excellent statements on the ADC program were published this year. They are the National Social Welfare Assembly's pamphlet *Aid to Dependent Children*, and the American Public Welfare Association's *ADC: Problem and Promise*. Both publications deserve wide distribution.

nation still reaction reflects our solve some

Those children the offend we have position.

A chie is that i wedlock this view responsi of need status of torial ch duce the that a he was publicize were no of-wedl a recent 9 per ce receiving of all s of their aid. Th commun case lo the soci

To c problem duce de sertion, fuse ca of these they re and fam and he the cyc the cu of the l services materia nity. T in the f known lies, an conditi we alre

CHIL

nation stem from such confusion and are a reaction to the fact that the ADC program reflects our failure to come to grips with and to solve some serious social problems.

Those of us committed to the welfare of children and their families have failed to take the offensive in the attacks on ADC. At best, we have assumed a rear-guard defensive position.

A chief attack made on the ADC program is that it encourages immorality and out-of-wedlock births. I confess my impatience with this view. Recently when I insisted on my responsibility to grant assistance on the basis of need and without regard to the wedlock status of dependent children, a newspaper editorial characterized my policy as a "you produce them, I'll feed them" approach. I submit that a hungry child is no less hungry because he was born out of wedlock. But have we publicized the fact that all ADC children were not born out of wedlock and not all out-of-wedlock children are receiving ADC? In a recent study done in North Carolina, only 9 per cent of all out-of-wedlock children were receiving ADC in 1959. Almost 91 percent of all such children were living in the midst of their own families without receiving public aid. The statistics vary from community to community, but whatever the data the ADC case load mirrors social change and reflects the social pathology in the community.

To charge that ADC is the cause of social problems is to evade the facts of life that produce dependency, unmarried motherhood, desertion, and family breakdown: it is to confuse cause and effect. The precipitating causes of these social problems are in the community; they reflect long years of neglect of children and families by voluntary and public social and health agencies and our failure to break the cycle of inadequate parents. They reflect the cumulative effects of austerity budgets, of the low priority given to health and welfare services and in the allocation of the available material and human resources in the community. They reflect, too, the failure of workers in the field of family and child welfare to make known what is happening to children and families, and to point the way to reversing these conditions with the knowledge and programs we already have and know how to use. They

reflect our failure to direct the attack not toward the effect but toward the causes.

It is disturbing to read in pamphlets and studies on ADC that "we have much less knowledge about the children on ADC than we have about their family setting." I am equally concerned to know how little study has been done in local communities of the factors that are contributing to the changed characteristics of the ADC case load, and to the increase in out-of-wedlock birth both in the ADC program and outside of it.

Creating a Climate of Concern

I would plead for aggressive leadership in developing a community climate that would make impossible denial to any child the full satisfaction of his needs, whatever the accidents of his birth, whether he is in the client group or not. I would urge that we employ every known technique and device to make known our tested knowledge and rich experience about how to meet the most basic needs of all children. If we do this, the social climate we create locally and nationally will prevent the budget cuts that cripple the extension of basic services to children and their families. It will make impossible the residence laws that bring emotional disadvantage to children whose families are caught in the web of residence and settlement, and who are denied placement with relatives in a state other than their own, even though that placement is in the best interest of the child. Our public assistance standards will reflect real community concern for the things beyond creature comforts that every child needs. Indeed, such a climate will embrace rather than attack our deep concern for children, and our drive to act in their behalf wherever they are, whatever their economic status, race, creed or national background.

If we take our commitment seriously, we will create an atmosphere of concern and thought that will see the delinquent child basically as a child whose needs have remained unmet, a child who reflects the inadequacy of basic services in a community. We then would have unanimous support for the development of a network of child welfare services that not only are prepared to treat and rehabilitate the delinquent, but also effectively contribute

to the prevention of delinquency. The kind of climate we create would reject the establishment of superstructures to deal with delinquent children, emotionally disturbed children, or any other fundamentally child welfare problem. It would fix responsibility for the care of children who need more assistance than their parents can and will give with those public and voluntary agencies equipped to give the kind of help they need. We would have communicated our commitment to legislators, newspaper editors, budget directors, and others who share in defining social policy. But we would also have refined and interpreted the knowledge and experience on which our commitment rests.

Our administrative compartments for dealing with children and their families would rest on a common base of knowledge, understanding and attitudes that would weld into one whole our fragmented service entities, structured as they too frequently are on symptom pictures rather than on child need. It is essential that we be clear about our structure and the place of each agency service in it.

The Need for Public Interpretation

If our commitment is to be effective in the interest of the well-being of children, and if the economy of adequate services is to be accepted, public interpretation in the Madison Avenue manner is essential. We need a public education and interpretation job that provides a sound, intelligent, humane orientation to the welfare of children. I suggest that we seize the initiative and rally the support of an informed community. If such an approach is "unprofessional," let's be that in the interest of children! To do otherwise, I believe, is to permit an atmosphere in our communities that condones striking out in retaliation, at children in trouble, that applauds or legalizes the denial of even creature comforts to children, that justifies cutting budgetary provisions for children and families, and makes asking for help a disgrace and crime. There may be a kind of economy in this approach but it is not in the interest of the community or the national welfare.

Our challenge today is to find ways that will create and sustain an atmosphere of thought and attitude in which each child's

welfare will be assured through services to him and his family in the home, and when necessary to him and his family outside his own home. Without such a community climate of attitudes, our efforts shall miss their mark; we shall always be concerned chiefly with children who have already suffered separation or deprivation; we shall continue to pick up broken pieces, and our commitment will not be to the welfare of all children.

The High Price of False Economy

Short-sighted, penny-wise-pound-foolish economy that deprives children and families of basic services is costly in dollars and costly in human values. Ours is the task of dramatizing to an uninformed public, not in cold abstract statistics, but in terms of human case illustrations, what the denial of adequate service in ADC programs means to the families across the railroad track and what it means to the economic and social well-being of the community.

Two other examples of the results of the inadequacy of services to children will dramatize how we have failed in our commitment to children and their families. Both come out of my own community, but I daresay they are not unique to it.

I have never understood our inability to sell homemaker service, not as a token program in the community, but one for which we are willing to spend even half of the money and effort we spend for treatment services required after family breakdown has occurred.

In 1957, the number of children in temporary care and the number of children waiting foster care placement began to climb to an all-time high of 2,300 in New York City. Shelters were critically overcrowded and hundreds of children were not receiving the kind of care they needed. We decided to examine the extent to which homemaker service was available and was being utilized to prevent the temporary placement of a group of 229 children in our public shelters. When one considers that temporary shelter care in New York City costs up to \$12 per day or over \$4,000 per year per child and the salary of a homemaker available to care for a number of children in a year and in their own homes is \$3,000 per year, our findings were shocking and dramatized the folly of our inadequacy in homemaker service. If homemaker service had been available, of the 229

children studied—143 in 61 families could have remained in their own homes, and 40 children in 18 families *might* have remained at home. Only 46 children in 21 families were faced with problems where placement seemed unavoidable.

What a travesty on child welfare practices and what a disservice to families and children. Beyond the financial economy that we might have realized had we provided the homemaker service, consider what possible harm and damage we did to children and families. We separated and placed 143 children and possibly 40 others who need not have been separated from their families; and we denied, by the unavailability of 183 places, placement to children awaiting care who really needed it. I might add that we have found that long-term placement becomes inevitable for too many children placed initially in temporary care. Once the separation is effected, the changes of reversing it become more difficult and frequently less likely. Many of the 143 children who went to temporary care shelters needlessly never returned to their own families.

One final example from my own community:

We have been seeking ways to shorten the length of stay in foster care in order to reunite families, and to free spaces in institutions and foster homes for some of the 1,500 children awaiting placement in New York City. In a recent study, we found that of 11,569 children now in foster care facilities, 754 could go home at once if adequate low-cost housing, with supportive services to the children and families, were available. We found, too, that 112 children might *not* have been placed at all had adequate housing with supportive services been available at the point of placement.

This means that 310 families were deprived of what I believe is every family's right—a full opportunity to remain intact, an opportunity to provide care and protection to its children, and the opportunity to make use of the counseling services, the financial assistance, the day care services, homemaker services and health services required to carry out its function as a family.

Among other things, the absence of adequate housing suggests to me that we need to review whether there is logic in failing to see public housing as a public welfare service rather than a publicly-subsidized real estate operation. Public housing may need to be

accepted as a necessary tool for strengthening family living for many children and their parents in every community in the land.

The economy of adequate services to families and children, whether we examine the ADC program, casework counseling for families and children, foster family and group day care, or homemaker services, cannot be denied.

The Public-Voluntary Relationship

Our relationship with each other as public and voluntary agencies in fulfilling our commitment to the cause of child welfare also bears review.

In certain areas of welfare, we have no problem in accepting government activity. Income maintenance and public health are but two ready examples. However, when we move in the name of the community to deal with problems involving family responsibilities and relationships, and to assure proper care of children, the situation is quite different. In child and family welfare, our fears of government activity become most evident. Some fear that government will take over the care and upbringing of children, and in the hands of demoniacal officials, direct this task for some sinister and subversive objective. Some fear that a public program in child welfare will disregard the past experience of voluntary agencies and emasculate or completely destroy acceptable standards and sound practice, or that it will threaten the continuation of the voluntary agency. Some fear that the assumption of any direct responsibility of the public agency in child welfare requires the denial of the right of sectarian auspices in caring for children, and the legitimate inculcation of moral and religious training by a particular religious community.

I dare say that in any given community any one or all of these fears are not without some substance. But they have blocked our clear and objective analysis of whether we cannot find an appropriate division of responsibility that is in the interest of all children and still preserves the tenets of our American democratic society.

The tax dollar and the contribution dollar come from the same pocket, and have as their sole objective total community betterment. The challenge to our professional and lay

leadership—to our commitment to child welfare particularly—to evolve a sound policy for achieving the common good, and the most appropriate structure for realizing our goals, still remains unanswered.

But whatever the reasons for our failure to achieve a rational and democratically sound arrangement in services to families and children, the result is the same—children are being denied their right to care when they need it. For this, every one of us must assume some measure of responsibility and search again for our failure to implement our conviction. It is imperative that we remember that children are neither "public" nor "voluntary." Children in need of care, and parents in need of help as parents, are the proper concern and responsibility of the entire community.

Development of services to children and their families, whether by public or voluntary agencies, must be geared to the needs of the children and families as presented today, and not in terms of a traditional but possibly outmoded image of the family in need. Feuding about areas of responsibility within the social welfare structure should not continue. If we start in good faith, public and voluntary agencies together, and in an experimental, trusting spirit, we will correct inequities as our experience dictates.

It seems clear to me that there is an urgent and impelling need for both public and voluntary effort in family and child welfare. If we can all accept this as a fact, we will have taken the first step in finding what the distribution of their responsibility should be. Certainly, it is not a matter of public versus voluntary auspices. Nor is it a question of whether one can provide a better quality of service than the other. What is urgently required is a clearly defined pattern of basic family and child welfare services, related to the unique characteristics of each community, reflecting sound social policy in welfare administration, designed to provide the help and care these families and children desperately need.

Involving Others in Seeking Solutions

As we reach out for causes and as we seek to devise effective preventive programs—and herein lies the only true economy—we shall

need the help of a variety of disciplines and scientists for the problems with which we deal, for indeed, all social problems grow out of the totality of community life. Economists, sociologists, psychologists, statesmen, politicians, and religious leaders must be part of the team that seeks solutions to our social problems and the ways to prevent them. What happens in Washington and our several state capitols in the field of housing, in social insurance developments, in assuring maintenance income, in health and education, in human rights determines the life blood and final reality of our commitment to family and child welfare. I suppose I am trying to emphasize a new dimension of our commitment—involve-ment of ourselves in new ways in doing our job and the involvement of many others by pro-viding the social tools and social climate needed. Social work does not have all of the answers to meeting the needs of families and children. True economy in developing ade-quate service demands that we implement our interdisciplinary concepts.

Our Commitment

Our commitment, we say, is child welfare and by that statement we mean that we are dedicated and devoted to the well-being of all of our children. I urge that we constantly review not only technique and treatment prac-tices, important as they are, but that we see our commitment in a wider context—creating the kind of attitude and social climate in the community that will identify with our com-mitment, and in which it can be the leaven-ing influence in community thought and action in the interest of children. Let us spell out the tragedies, the human waste and deterioration that follows false economy in human welfare. I urge that together, public and voluntary agencies join as responsible, interdependent partners. I urge that we involve all who have a contribution to make to assuring the kind of community in which children can grow in physical, social, emotional, and spiritual health and well-being.

This, I believe, is one effective and lasting way to shorten the distance we have to go in eradicating man's inhumanity to children. It is not only good economy; it is sound social welfare.

COTTAGE PARENTS IN A TREATMENT INSTITUTION

James F. Berwald, M.D.

Medical Director

Children's Aid Society

Cleveland, Ohio

Assistant Clinical Professor in Child Psychiatry

Western Reserve University

A residential treatment center trains cottage parents toward an increasing integration in the over-all treatment program.

FIRST, I should like to explain our use of the term *cottage parents*. There are several other titles—such as *child care workers*, *supervisors*, *cottage counselors*—which are used to describe the persons who do the same kind of work in other residential institutions for children. But these titles seem sterile, and their use may express an unconscious wish either to derogate from the importance of parents in a child's life or to deny that anyone could replace the parents. Consciously, it is sometimes argued that the term *cottage parents* is undesirable because it implies to the child that he is expected to have filial feelings toward certain people. Anyone who has worked in a children's institution surely must observe that the attachments of children to adults would scarcely be influenced one way or another by such artifice as a title. At Children's Aid Society, we use the term *cottage parents* not because of any implications about emotional ties, but because it best describes the role which such persons play in the lives of the children in our institution—the role of substitute parents.

But again, this role itself is a matter of controversy. In some treatment institutions it is believed that the child can be helped best by a sort of treatment blitzkrieg, almost twenty-four hours a day, involving the use of professionally-trained people in the living arrangement who can deal, Johnny-on-the-spot, with any problem which the child may express. Other arguments to support this use of professional persons are that they can understand better the problems of the children; they should know better how to handle the children's behavior or misbehavior; they are able to communicate better with other professional staff such as therapists, caseworkers, psychologists and psychiatrists; they reduce the amount of in-service training required; and their being professionals tends to reduce the

jealousies over status which exist in an institution.

All too often, these arguments may be rationalizations used to cover up deficiencies in a treatment program. And, although the super-intensive, around-the-clock treatment approach seems impressive, it does not seem to allow for other very important needs of the children which we believe are met more adequately in a less intense atmosphere, and by persons who can better establish a more nearly homelike setting. These other important needs are the development of ego and superego beyond the direct influence of treatment. Just as in medicine, no therapist *cures* anyone, but only removes that which blocks the innate curative forces within the individual. And those curative and developmental forces need an environment in which the accent is not on treatment, but on controls, discipline, standards and protection in an atmosphere of empathic understanding and affection.

In his own home, the child's parents normally provide this environment; in an institution the cottage parents are the parent substitutes in that they fulfill these obligations to the child. There are other ways, too, in which the cottage parents act like the child's parents: They spend more time with the child than do other personnel and are the ones most involved with his physical care. At Children's Aid Society, they prepare breakfast and serve other meals and eat in the cottages with the children; they look after the children's clothing; they supervise homework and sometimes attend PTA meetings for children who go to outside schools; and they take children to church, to movies and on outings.

If one accepts this interpretation of the role of cottage parents, one may ask, "What kind of persons might be best qualified for such a

job?" It would be a simple task to make a list of those character qualities one would like to see in ideal parents, but where could one find such paragons? Lay persons of stable character, who have a healthy interest in children and are interested in learning through in-service training, have worked out best in our program. The amount of their formal education seems relatively unimportant. Some of them are older persons, married or widowed, who have reared children of their own, while others, younger, draw upon their unusual capacity for empathy with the children. In general, the qualities of character strength, experience and innate ability have seemed to outweigh, by far, any possible advantages of professional or pre-professional education. And too many treatment "cooks" may spoil the broth.

Cottage Parents and the Team Approach

The "team approach" has become classic in the field of child psychiatry and operates in most settings, both out-patient and residential. However, while the clinic team is an all-professional one, the residential team usually comprises lay persons as well as the usual members of professional disciplines. Naturally, the cottage parents feel lowest in status within this group, partly for realistic reasons. They know that their pay scale is lower than those of the professionals, and that in the community the professionals have greater prestige. And the dearth of recognition of their work as constituting a profession, or calling, leaves them with little opportunity to feel any identification with a group of their own.

Because of these inequalities, it is even more difficult to achieve an integrated, co-operative effort than it is in the all-professional team, which is often rife with professional jealousies. But the situation is made still more difficult by other inequalities, some fancied, but others having sometimes, unfortunately and needlessly, some basis in reality. The fact that they work in a *treatment* institution may mean to cottage parents that their work is quite incidental to the work of the professional staff. This impression may be augmented if there exists in the institution the previously

mentioned derogatory attitude toward parent figures, or if any individual or collective needs for the aggrandizement of professional status are expressed. The term *treatment institution* seems to imply that the most important part of the program is the professional treatment of the children. But the opportunities for ego and character development afforded the children in the living situation are equally important, and it is the cottage parents who are most concerned with that aspect of the program. To try to determine which is more important is like trying to decide whether one's heart or lungs are more important. Both are essential.

Another source of dissension in the team stems from the frequent tendency of people who work with children to feel competitive over attention and affection from the children. Cottage parents may believe, often without any real reason, that the therapists or the group workers have the inside track to the children's affection. This may lead them to adopt an unhealthy, overly permissive, "buddy" approach to the children, as well as hostile attitudes toward the professionals.

Undoubtedly, there are other problems of similar nature with this kind of mixed staff, but these should suffice to point up the importance in such a treatment program of adequate in-service training for cottage parents. Just as in a family, harmony, cooperation and unity are necessary for the maintenance of an atmosphere of stability, which is so essential to a feeling of security in children.

Training Meetings

Over a period of several years, we at Children's Aid Society have developed a growing conviction about benefits derived from our training of cottage parents toward an increasing integration in the over-all treatment program. This training is accomplished by means of different kinds of meetings, held regularly each week, plus many individual conferences with all members of the professional staff.

One of the meetings is a one-and-a-half-hour session with all cottage parents and all social workers, conducted by the medical director. The discussion is never planned and the cottage parents are urged to bring up any kind

of problem. They do just that and, since it is their meeting and the professional staff restrain their own participation, the cottage parents have grown self-confident and can express themselves very freely. Most of the discussions center around the care and management of children, their emotional needs and emotional problems and the normal growth of personality. The problems and attitudes of the children's real parents, as well as the cottage parents' attitudes and behavior toward the real parents, are also examined frequently.

Although the cottage parents bring up many specific examples in order to delineate certain problems or to illustrate points of discussion, the discussions by the medical director are deliberately held, as much as possible, to consideration of broad principles. One reason for this is that some of the problems concern too few of the cottage parents; for instance, a discussion of how to handle a girl's expressed concern over onset of menses would have little application in the boys' groups. Also, this practice makes it possible to reach cottage parents on two levels of learning: in another type of meeting they are helped to make concrete, specific application of these broader principles to the specific problems of management which they encounter.

Many subjects reappear for discussion fairly often: for example, discipline and punishment (we do not permit physical punishment), eating problems, runaways, stealing, sex play. But the cottage parents also feel free to bring up many other things—gripes about each other, about the administration, about the food and about their work schedules. When the gripes are legitimate, steps are taken to try to rectify things. The medical director often talks about prejudice (professional staff, lay staff and child population are all racially mixed), the responsibilities of adults toward children, setting standards by example, the importance of working together, the importance of cottage parents' observations and of communications with the professional staff. In all of these discussions, use of technical terms is avoided so that the cottage parents do not develop a jargon in order to feel more professional. Their essential part in our program is often pointed out to them and, although they are aware of their

lower status in the community, they know they are regarded highly within the institution. There probably is not one of them who is not proud of what he does and of the way he does it.

Another kind of session is a one-hour, weekly meeting of the chief social worker and the group worker with the four cottage parents of each living unit. These sessions are similar to those with the medical director in that complaints or differences of opinion are aired, and there is constant effort toward helping the cottage parents toward a fairly uniform set of attitudes and practices, particularly in regard to discipline and punishment. In this meeting, principles are applied to the specific problems encountered in care and management of the children. Such help is also available to the cottage parents informally at any hour, day or night. However, cottage parents are not spoon-fed solutions to all their problems. They are always urged to take the initiative in dealing with problems and, when mistakes are made, they are discussed to determine what went wrong and why. Much of the self-confidence the cottage parents feel comes from their growing awareness that they have gradually assimilated a considerable body of knowledge about children and the "know how" to handle most situations themselves.

A third type of meeting in which cottage parents participate is the one-and-a-half-hour weekly case conference, which is a sort of general report on a child's progress in the cottage, in groups, in school and in treatment. These conferences, held approximately every four to eight months on each child, are in addition to the all-professional treatment conferences for each child and the school conferences on individual learning problems. Case conferences are attended by social workers, cottage parents, teachers (when the child attends our school), school monitor and activities personnel, and are led by the medical director. A brief case history is presented by the child's caseworker, and this is followed by progress reports from all persons involved with that child; discussion then centers mainly on understanding the child's problems and planning his over-all management in the living situation, in activities and in school. In

relation to case history (both family and individual development), the discussion may include various aspects of personality development as well as the psychodynamic evolution of the child's problems. No information of this kind is withheld, and cottage parents are taught the importance of confidentiality. None has ever been known to violate that confidence.

Cottage parents have many other regularly scheduled individual conferences with the case-workers, group worker and teachers, to say nothing of the many informal discussions with all of the professional staff as the need arises, or in casual contacts such as in the staff dining room. In all of their contacts they are regarded with respect, as equals, and their observations and reporting, as well as their management of children in the living situation, are considered of inestimable value in the total treatment program. Cottage parents' feeling of "status" in the institution and the minimization of jealousies that exist, plus the extent of their education, show up strongly in their individual conferences with therapists, where their eagerness to impart observations and the perspicacity of those observations is of tremendous help to the therapists. Would that real parents of children in treatment could contribute so much!

Some Conclusions

And now for some of the conclusions to which our experience and observations have led us. Earlier, I stated that the arguments in favor of use of professionals as cottage parents often covered up deficiencies in the program. It would appear that most of the seeming advantages of such an approach are provided by a truly adequate training program for cottage parents. The description of our methods should demonstrate that this is not an easy, nor an incidental, task in a treatment program, but rather a continuous, major effort. We feel that the results have warranted the expenditure of that effort.

The hiring, keeping and integration of cottage parent staff is a chronic problem in many institutions. Suitable people are hard to find, and often a rapid turnover in such personnel is considered inevitable. And their failure to become integrated produces innumerable prob-

lems in a treatment program, such as a breakdown in communications, creation of staff tensions, and a defective program of child care and management. Furthermore, rapid turnover of staff seriously threatens the children's very great need for a feeling of security, and an ineffectual or inadequate training program constitutes a financial and professional waste. Another idea which is hard to accept is that turnover of cottage parent staff is a healthy thing, since they tend to "burn out" and become less able to perform in that kind of work in a few years. This might be so if an attempt is made only to pseudo-professionalize them and to fill them with a lot of useless lingo, but not if they are really educated and helped to acquire an integrated body of knowledge and understanding of children, and the ability to apply that knowledge. We would really hate to lose them, in that case—unless, of course, our institution was set up as a specific training center for such workers. At Children's Aid Society, staff turnover has now become minimal.

The cottage parents' job offers no opportunity for advancement in position, so that the job must offer other gratifications. Besides the gratification derived from helping children—which they can be helped to find—they need a feeling of recognition for what they know and can do. Since the community could not be expected to offer this if the institution does not, the first recognition of the cottage parent as a true professional must occur within the institution. And lastly, as true professionals, the cottage parents are entitled to financial recognition of their status and of the important responsibilities they carry.

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO INTERNATIONAL SUMMER SCHOOL

offers a special course in 1961 on

THE FAMILY IN THE NORWEGIAN
SOCIAL AND CULTURAL SETTING,
July 1-20, 1961 in Oslo, Norway.

Write: OSLO INTERNATIONAL SUMMER
SCHOOL, Northfield, Minnesota

THE INTERSTATE COMPACT ON THE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN

Harold Hagen

Children and Youth Specialist
American Public Welfare Association

THE placement of children for foster care or adoption is hazardous enough under the best of circumstances; but when state lines are crossed in the process the possibilities for mischance and confusion are multiplied. Such factors as longer distances, divided responsibilities, multiple jurisdictions and agencies, and diverse and even conflicting laws and procedures are usually involved to a greater extent than when children are placed within their home state.

These are among the reasons why most social agencies ordinarily refrain from interstate placement in the absence of overriding considerations to the contrary. A small but significant number of children, however, genuinely require care or treatment of a kind not available to them in their home state. Any extensive listing of examples would probably defy classification: it would include such situations as children needing specialized medical, educational or institutional facilities; children of minority racial, ethnic or religious backgrounds; and children living with foster parents who move to another state.

Only rough estimates are available as to the number of children placed outside their state by social agencies, but an inquiry in 1957 indicated that state by state it ranges from a very few up to one or two hundred a year. Regardless of the number, however, the special complexities of the cases require special procedures and safeguards.

Need for Improved Laws and Procedures

About the turn of the century, states began to establish controls on the importation of dependent children, and by now all states have worked out some method for carrying out their responsibilities. The early laws were intended primarily for the protection of the state, but in more recent years they have also reflected a greater concern for the protection

Important facts on a long-overdue measure to protect children in interstate placement.

of children. There is now less posting of bonds and more reliance on informal agreements, and social agencies are generally allowed greater latitude in the exercise of professional discretion. The serious shortcoming of all existing interstate arrangements, however, is that they are fundamentally unilateral, and thus lack authority for defining relationship, responsibilities and jurisdiction among all parties.

A number of leading organizations in social welfare and government have recognized the need for improved laws and procedures in interstate placement, and have directed their attention to that end. The American Public Welfare Association, the Council of State Governments, and especially the Children's Bureau have participated in this effort. From 1947 to 1951 the Children's Bureau sponsored a series of regional conferences on interstate placement of children. These conferences succeeded very well in identifying the elements and objectives of interstate placement, and on the basis of these discussions an "Agreement on Philosophy, Policies and Procedures on Interstate Placement" was drafted.

The wide use of the reports of these conferences as guide material by state welfare departments has contributed significantly in recent years to the improvement of standards and procedures. While some states are now fairly well able to handle interstate placements according to the best interest of the individuals concerned, voluntary cooperation has failed to bring about the prevailing climate of reciprocity, uniformity and common purpose which is essential to the effective conduct of a service of this kind.

One of the possible approaches considered by the Children's Bureau conferences was the use of the interstate compact as a means for achieving this needed uniformity. More recently this has also been explored by the

American Public Welfare Association, through its Committee on Services for Children and Youth and its National Council of State Directors of Programs for Children and Youth, and by a number of state officials affiliated with the Council of State Governments. The successful application of the compact device to other aspects of social welfare—notably the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers, which has been adopted by every state, and the Interstate Compact on Juveniles,¹ which has so far been adopted by twenty-eight states—has also suggested the obvious parallel in child placement.

The Proposed Placement Compact

In the place of abstract discussion a specific proposal has now been put forward in the form of a document known as the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children.² This Compact was developed under the auspices of the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation, under the chairmanship of Senator Elisha T. Barrett. It is noteworthy that this committee, in collaboration with its counterparts in the states comprising the Northeastern Region of the Council of State Governments, has also taken the lead in the drafting and promotion of a number of other compacts on social welfare subjects. These include the above-mentioned Compact on Juveniles, as well as the Compact on Mental Health and the more recent Compact on Welfare Services. (The latter compact, which is not yet operative, is designed to eliminate residence requirements for welfare services, including assistance, among the compacting states.)

At a meeting called by Senator Barrett in New York City early this year, representatives from a wide range of interested agencies and organizations reviewed and endorsed, with minor amendments, the draft of the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children. The report of the meeting states that:

¹ The major purposes of the Compact on Juveniles are: (1) to permit out-of-state supervision of a delinquent juvenile who should be sent to some other state other than where he got into trouble, and who is eligible for probation or parole; (2) to provide for return to their home states of runaways who have not been adjudged delinquent; (3) to provide for return of absconders and escapees to the states from which they absconded or escaped; and (4) to authorize agreements for the cooperative institutionalization of special types of juveniles, such as psychotics and defective delinquents.

² Ed. Note: The text of the compact begins on page 15.

"Social welfare commissioners and staff, children's court judges, representatives from attorneys general, members of commissions on interstate cooperation and private child welfare organizations attended together with representation from the Children's Bureau of the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"Officials from twelve states attended and they unanimously approved the Compact."

The basic purpose of the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children is the protection of children involved in interstate placements. It provides an orderly and uniform procedure whereby the responsible agencies in both states determine that a proposed placement is in the best interests of the child, and establish the continuing responsibility and jurisdiction of the sending state.

Consistent with its leadership in developing this compact, the State of New York was also the first, and so far the only, state to adopt it. Very few other state legislatures have been in session since this document became available, but reports are that it will be introduced in a number of states in 1961. As far as New York is concerned the compact took effect on September 1, 1960, although it will only become operative as other states join.

The Nature of Interstate Compacts

This compact, more than any other enacted or proposed, would directly involve child welfare agencies, both public and voluntary. In fact, with the partial exception of the Compact on Juveniles, the child welfare field has no previous experience in working with compacts of any kind. Since interstate compacts in general differ in a number of ways from other types of legislation, some comments on their distinguishing characteristics may be useful.

Expositions on the nature of compacts ordinarily begin with a reference to Article I, Section 10, of the Constitution, which provides that no state shall enter into agreements or compacts with another state or foreign power without the consent of Congress. The implication, naturally, is that with the consent of Congress, states may enter into compacts.

The requirement for the consent of Congress has been judicially interpreted to mean

that on political require disapp still be of com Congre no app on chil

Whi in eff lishmen within found pacts v bounda matter fires, v ministr the be Port A

The chilrda author L. Zin subjec written

"To pact, i ing cha 2. It selves, an int state l called ally i compa sent o Congr actme prem 6. It statut

"The traste spects admirably specti islatu 2. Or chara which force

CHI

that only those agreements which affect the political balance within the Federal system require Congressional approval. Approval or disapproval of any compact may, of course, still be expressed, and is binding. A number of compacts are currently in effect without Congressional approval, and it is assumed that no approval would be required for a compact on child placement.

While some interstate compacts have been in effect since (and even before) the establishment of the Federal government, it is only within the last forty years that they have found extensive application. The early compacts were almost wholly concerned with state boundaries. There are now compacts on such matters as higher education, fisheries, forest fires, water usage and pollution, and the administration of common functions, of which the best-known example is the New York Port Authority.

The proposed compact on the placement of children was drafted by two of the leading authorities on interstate compacts, Frederick L. Zimmerman and Mitchell Wendell. On the subject of compacts in general, they have written as follows:

"To delineate the essence of the interstate compact, it may be emphasized that it has the following characteristics: 1. It is formal and contractual. 2. It is an agreement between the states themselves, similar in content, form, and wording to an international treaty, and usually embodied in state law in an identifiable and separate document called the '*compact*.' 3. It is enacted in substantially identical words by the legislature of each compacting state. 4. At least in certain cases, consent of Congress must be obtained; in all cases, Congress may forbid the compact by specific enactment. 5. It can be enforced by suit in the Supreme Court of the United States if necessary. 6. It takes precedence over an ordinary state statute.

"The administrative agreement can be contrasted with the compact in several important respects. 1. It is formulated and entered into by administrative officials in a particular field, normally under authorizing legislation of their respective states, but *without any action by the legislatures upon the specific agreements reached*. 2. On its face it purports to be contractual in character, but there is no judicial precedent from which it can be concluded that the courts will enforce all types of administrative agreement. 3. It

often is embodied in a more or less formal document by the administrative officials of the states concerned, but the agreement as such is not embodied in state statutes. 4. These agreements never have been brought before Congress because consent to them never has been thought necessary. 5. Generally speaking they are inferior to state legislative action."³

Advantages of the Proposed Compact

The Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children is in a sense a bare framework which would draw much of its substance from the existing internal state programs, and from interstate procedures that would be developed by joint action of the state compact administrators. Thus, the unevenness in the quality and coverage of services that now exists from one state to another would not necessarily be replaced by a high common level under this compact, and certainly a state would not be expected to do better for children coming from other states than it can do for its own. The greater degree of cooperation and common effort possible under the compact, however, might be expected to have an encouraging effect for the improvement of the intrastate as well as the interstate aspects of child placement services.

One of the greatest advantages offered by this compact is the clarification of continuing responsibility and jurisdiction, and of the relationships between the several cooperating agencies. The agency having responsibility for the support of a child in the home state would continue to have it in the receiving state. Orders for custody and guardianship issued in the home state would continue in force and would not be changed by courts in the receiving state. The agency in the home state would retain the responsibility for final decision on matters affecting the over-all placement plans; the receiving agency would act as the agent of the home state agency.

If anyone would question the need for special measures to establish these simple principles, he might call upon the nearest state welfare department for enlightenment.

The fact that interstate placement frequently involves joint action among multiple

³ Frederick L. Zimmerman and Mitchell Wendell, *The Interstate Compact Since 1925*, The Council of State Governments, 1951, p. 42.

agencies, both public and voluntary, within each state further emphasizes the need for some system that will promote coordination among these various agencies and services as they carry out their appropriate functions. The proposed compact is designed to accomplish this purpose without imposing any new order of controls on the private agencies. Some modifications in clearance and communication would undoubtedly be necessary for the sake of uniformity, but they should not be any more restricting than current regulations in well-organized programs.

This compact should thus facilitate interstate placement when it is found by authorized agencies to be socially desirable; it might also be expected to enhance the opportunities for selecting suitable homes for children through the easier accessibility to wider geographic areas.

Conversely the greater effectiveness of authorized services, together with strengthened enforcement provisions, should serve to discourage irregular or illegal activities; for example, interstate black market or gray market adoptive placements. Under the proposed compact such placements would be in violation of the laws of both states, and subject to penalties in either jurisdiction. It should be noted, however, that the compact does not extend to the placement of children by relatives with relatives.

Some of the most difficult and damaging situations which affect children are those resulting from placements that are illegal under present laws and would be illegal under the compact. These are often the cases which come to light only after everything has gone wrong. The welfare of the children then becomes obscured by endless disputes over jurisdictional and financial responsibility. There is nothing specific in this compact that would ease the solution of situations of this kind. The mechanisms of interstate cooperation which it provides for, however, might well enable states to work out settlements that would keep the best interests of the children in the foreground.

In recent years a number of bills have been introduced in Congress calling for Federal

legislation "to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for free care or for adoption." These measures would prohibit the placement of children in interstate commerce in violation of the laws of the states involved. In comparison with the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children, these proposals seem deficient in that they would establish criminal sanctions in Federal law but no machinery for improved procedures, and they would not promote uniformity. Because of the variations in state laws and regulations, therefore, a given action could be a Federal offense in one state and not in another.

Any state considering the possible advantages of joining in this compact would do well to give careful attention to the selection of the "officer who shall be the general coordinator of activities under this compact." This is a matter upon which each compacting state would be free to decide, but it is a decision of major consequence in determining the effectiveness of the compact. Every one of its features is directly related to the total child-placing and child-caring program of the state, and the person who serves as the compact administrator should therefore be someone who is a part of that program. Ordinarily that would be the director of the state department of public welfare, or the director of the division of children and youth services in the department. The assignment of this function to some other agency could well result in compounding the present confusion, and would create unnecessary obstacles to sound administration.

The proposed Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children seems to offer the most workable means yet devised to overcome the conflicts and limitations which stand in the way of effective services in the interstate placement of children. It would not only provide a basis for responsible and orderly procedures, but it would also enable the states, through the established welfare agencies, to make the well-being of the children the first consideration as they carry on the program. The more states participating in the compact, the greater the cumulative effect of these advantages will be.

INTERSTATE COMPACT ON THE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN*

ARTICLE I. PURPOSE AND POLICY

It is the purpose and policy of the party states to cooperate with each other in the interstate placement of children to the end that:

(a) Each child requiring placement shall receive the maximum opportunity to be placed in a suitable environment and with persons or institutions having appropriate qualifications and facilities to provide a necessary and desirable degree and type of care.

(b) The appropriate authorities in a state where a child is to be placed may have full opportunity to ascertain the circumstances of the proposed placement, thereby promoting full compliance with applicable requirements for the protection of the child.

(c) The proper authorities of the state from which the placement is made may obtain the most complete information on the basis of which to evaluate a projected placement before it is made.

(d) Appropriate jurisdictional arrangements for the care of children will be promoted.

ARTICLE II. DEFINITIONS

As used in this compact:

(a) "Child" means a person who, by reason of minority, is legally subject to parental, guardianship or similar control.

(b) "Sending agency" means a party state, officer or employee thereof; a subdivision of a party state, or officer or employee thereof; a court of a party state; a person, corporation, association, charitable agency or other entity which sends, brings, or causes to be sent or brought any child to another party state.

(c) "Receiving State" means the state to which a child is sent, brought, or caused to be sent or brought, whether by public authorities or private persons or agencies, and whether for placement with state or local public authorities or for placement with private agencies or persons.

(d) "Placement" means the arrangement for the care of a child in a family free or boarding home or in a child-caring agency or institution but does not include any institution caring for

the mentally ill, mentally defective or epileptic or any institution primarily educational in character, and any hospital or other medical facility.

ARTICLE III. CONDITIONS FOR PLACEMENT

(a) No sending agency shall send, bring, or cause to be sent or brought into any other party state any child for placement in foster care or as a preliminary to a possible adoption unless the sending agency shall comply with each and every requirement set forth in this article and with the applicable laws of the receiving state governing the placement of children therein.

(b) Prior to sending, bringing or causing any child to be sent or brought into a receiving state for placement in foster care or as a preliminary to a possible adoption, the sending agency shall furnish the appropriate public authorities in the receiving state written notice of the intention to send, bring, or place the child in the receiving state. The notice shall contain:

(1) The name, date and place of birth of the child.

(2) The identity and address or addresses of the parents or legal guardian.

(3) The name and address of the person, agency or institution to or with which the sending agency proposes to send, bring, or place the child.

(4) A full statement of the reasons for such proposed action and evidence of the authority pursuant to which the placement is proposed to be made.

(c) Any public officer or agency in a receiving state which is in receipt of a notice pursuant to paragraph (b) of this article may request of the sending agency, or any other appropriate officer or agency of or in the sending agency's state, and shall be entitled to receive therefrom, such supporting or additional information as it may deem necessary under the circumstances to carry out the purpose and policy of this compact.

(d) The child shall not be sent, brought, or caused to be sent or brought into the receiving state until the appropriate public authorities in the receiving state shall notify the sending agency, in writing, to the effect that the proposed placement does not appear to be contrary to the interests of the child.

ARTICLE IV. PENALTY FOR ILLEGAL PLACEMENT

The sending, bringing, or causing to be sent or brought into any receiving state of a child in violation of the terms of this compact shall constitute a violation of the laws respecting the placement of children of both the state in which the

* Developed at a special conference held in New York City on January 22, 1960. Social welfare commissioners and staff, Children's Court Judges, representatives from attorneys general, members of commissions on interstate cooperation and private child welfare organizations attended together with representation from the Children's Bureau of the Federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Officials from 12 states attended and they unanimously approved the compact.

sending agency is located or from which it sends or brings the child and of the receiving state. Such violation may be punished or subjected to penalty in either jurisdiction in accordance with its laws. In addition to liability for any such punishment or penalty, any such violation shall constitute full and sufficient grounds for the suspension or revocation of any license, permit, or other legal authorization held by the sending agency which empowers or allows it to place, or care for children.

ARTICLE V. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

(a) The sending agency shall retain jurisdiction over the child sufficient to determine all matters in relation to the custody, supervision, care, treatment and disposition of the child which it would have had if the child had remained in the sending agency's state, until the child is adopted, reaches majority, becomes self supporting or is discharged with the concurrence of the appropriate authority in the receiving state. Such jurisdiction shall also include the power to effect or cause the return of the child or its transfer to another location and custody pursuant to law. The sending agency shall continue to have financial responsibility for support and maintenance of the child during the period of the placement. Nothing contained herein shall defeat a claim of jurisdiction by a receiving state sufficient to deal with an act of delinquency or crime committed therein.

(b) When the sending agency is a public agency, it may enter into an agreement with an authorized public or private agency in the receiving state providing for the performance of one or more services in respect of such case by the latter as agent for the sending agency.

(c) Nothing in this compact shall be construed to prevent a private charitable agency authorized to place children in the receiving state from performing services or acting as agent in that state for a private charitable agency of the sending state; nor to prevent the agency in the receiving state from discharging financial responsibility for the support and maintenance of a child who has been placed on behalf of the sending agency without relieving the responsibility set forth in paragraph (a) hereof.

ARTICLE VI. INSTITUTIONAL CARE OF DELINQUENT CHILDREN

A child adjudicated delinquent may be placed in an institution in another party jurisdiction pursuant to this compact, but no such placement shall be made unless the child is given a court hearing on notice to the parent or guardian with

opportunity to be heard, prior to his being sent to such other party jurisdiction for institutional care and the court finds that:

1. Equivalent facilities for the child are not available in the sending agency's jurisdiction; and
2. Institutional care in the other jurisdiction is in the best interest of the child and will not produce undue hardship.

ARTICLE VII. COMPACT ADMINISTRATOR

The executive head of each jurisdiction party to this compact shall designate an officer who shall be general coordinator of activities under this compact in his jurisdiction and who, acting jointly with like officers of other party jurisdictions, shall have power to promulgate rules and regulations to carry out more effectively the terms and provisions of this compact.

ARTICLE VIII. LIMITATIONS

This compact shall not apply to:

(a) The sending or bringing of a child into a receiving state by his parent, step-parent, grandparent, adult brother or sister, adult uncle or aunt, or his guardian and leaving the child with any such relative or non-agency guardian in the receiving state.

(b) Any placement, sending or bringing of a child into a receiving state pursuant to any other interstate compact to which both the state from which the child is sent or brought and the receiving state are party, or to any other agreement between said states which has the force of law.

ARTICLE IX. ENACTMENT AND WITHDRAWAL

This compact shall be open to joinder by any state, Territory or Possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and, with the consent of Congress, the Government of Canada or any province thereof. It shall become effective with respect to any such jurisdiction when such jurisdiction has enacted the same into law. Withdrawal from this compact shall be by the enactment of a statute repealing the same, but shall not take effect until two years after the effective date of such statute and until written notice of the withdrawal has been given by the withdrawing state to the governor of each other party jurisdiction. Withdrawal of a party state shall not affect the rights, duties and obligations under this compact of any sending agency therein with respect to a placement made prior to the effective date of withdrawal.

ARTICLE X. CONSTRUCTION AND SEVERABILITY

The provisions of this compact shall be liberally construed to effectuate the purposes thereof. The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phrase, clause, sentence or provision of this compact is declared to be contrary to the constitution of any party state or of the United States or the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. If this compact shall be held contrary to the constitution of any state party thereto, the compact shall remain in full force and effect as to the remaining states and in full force and effect as to the state affected as to all severable matters.

Ed. Note: To conserve space, we have not printed the text of the "Model Enabling Act for Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children." It can be obtained from the Council of State Governments, 1313 E. 60 St., Chicago, Ill.

The George Warren Brown School of Social Work

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

St. Louis 30, Missouri

Admission in Fall Semester only.

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

A professional two-year curriculum, largely generic. Field instruction available in family casework, child welfare, medical, psychiatric, group work, public welfare, community organization, research, corrections, and school settings. Scholarships and stipends are offered on a competitive basis.

DOCTOR OF SOCIAL WORK

A professional degree based on a research concentration.

Early inquiry and application advised. For further information, write to the Dean.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

Master of Social Work

A graduate two-year program in preparation for casework or group work practice in all fields of social work.

Advanced Curriculum Certificate

A third year program in administration, casework, community organization, group work, research, supervision or teaching. Open to experienced social workers with a Master's degree in Social Work.

Doctor of Social Work

A doctoral program offering the opportunity to develop scholarly and professional competence for leadership in social work. Open to the experienced social worker with a Master of Social Work degree. Advanced Curriculum credits applicable.

Financial grants available

Address: DR. MARGARET E. BISHOP

Director of Admissions
University of Pennsylvania
School of Social Work
2410 Pine St., Phila. 3, Pa.

SMITH COLLEGE SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL WORK A Graduate Professional School

*Programs Leading to the Degree
Master of Social Work*

Plan A Curriculum—Three summer sessions in study on the Smith campus and two winter sessions in field work in selected agencies or clinics

Plan B Curriculum—Two summer sessions and one winter session designed for applicants who have had substantial professional experience or previous graduate work

Academic Year Opens June 21, 1961

Program of Advanced Study (Third Year)
Leading to Diploma—To prepare for practice, supervision, and teaching

June 21, 1961 to August 29, 1962

For further information write to

THE DIRECTOR COLLEGE HALL 8
Northampton, Massachusetts

AN AGENCY CLEANS HOUSE

Joseph E. Paull
Child Welfare Case Supervisor
"La Paz, Santa Ana County" *

UPON the small southwestern city of La Paz, where the jagged snow-capped Rockies begin to meet the desert, a research team descended in the fall of 1957 to find some explanations for the most depressing blight in the child welfare field, the ever-growing accumulation of children in foster care. The Child Welfare League of America had selected La Paz as one of nine urban and rural communities in the U.S. where they hoped to find some answers to the evident nationwide resentment about the failure of agencies to plan adequately for the long-term needs of children.

The accusations were well-known, for some mass publications had been having a field day with them: Children were being doomed to a lifetime of temporary boarding care, a legal limbo, a social dead end, while from Maine to California families were clamoring to adopt children.

In La Paz the researchers acquired the oldest community in the study, a heterogeneous city with a rich and colorful past. It is one of the few places left in the U.S. where the encroaching "Anglo" culture of urban industrial standardization still vies with vigorous survivals of old Indian and Spanish cultures.

The researchers found that these ethnic differences gave La Paz a "segmented" character. It is divided roughly between unskilled, uneducated, socially deprived Spanish-Americans and Indians who are overwhelmingly Catholic, and middle-class, educated, socially advantaged Anglos who are predominantly Protestant.

They said it was a tradition-bound place, still steeped in the values of other centuries and taking aggressive pride in resisting bigness, modernization, or swift change. These old values included an old-world attitude so staunchly protective of parental rights that a

What happened as a result of one agency's participation in the CWLA foster care study of nine communities.

local judge could say with some pride, "I have never removed a child permanently from his own home."

They found a professional child-caring program in a public agency providing for 88 percent of the community's dependent children but isolated from its own community and lacking even the support of its own policy-makers. "There was probably no community that we studied," the researchers concluded, "where the difference between board members' attitudes and staff members' attitudes was more marked."

Some Sober Findings

This served to explain, perhaps, but hardly to prepare the community for, the sad story told by the charts and tables which the tabulating machines ground out in a dismal procession. Add the figures or subtract them, they told of the problem the League was seeking to unravel:

Of children going into foster care, La Paz had the highest rate of children going into homes rather than institutions, but close to the lowest percent going into adoption.

Of any community studied, La Paz had the highest percentage of children ready for adoption if homes could be found.

La Paz had the lowest rate of children returning to their own homes from foster care. The proportion of parents actively planning for return home of their children was "by far" the lowest.

Of children likely to remain in foster care unless some alternatives were developed, La Paz had the second-highest percentage.

The average age of the child in foster care was eight and a half years. The average child had been in care three years.

Religious barriers, racial differences, ambiguous and conflicting laws, all operated to further prevent adoption of children already handicapped in large proportion by symptoms of early parental neglect.

The conclusion was inescapable that the program was "enmeshed in a long-term care situation" that for too many children became a dead-end until a warped and brittle pseudo-

* This is the fictitious name which was used in the League's study of foster care to disguise one of the communities studied. For a complete report of the study see *Children in Need of Parents*, by Henry S. Maas and Richard E. Engler, Jr., Columbia University Press, N. Y., 1959. A digest of *Children in Need of Parents*, in pamphlet form, has been published by the League.

adulthood liberated them. This conclusion was founded on the recognition that there is no better place for a child to grow up than in his own home whenever possible, with parents and one permanent family. Where foster care is a necessary substitute for some, it remains only a substitute, with all the limitations that substitution implies.

The Community Goes Into Action

Action proceeded from two directions. One was what the agency itself proceeded to do with an "agonizing reappraisal" of its program. The other was the support the community gave to these changes through the formation of a Foster Care Committee as a unit of its Community Council.

They were agreed at the outset that it might be too late for many of the children, and that the emphasis belonged with breaking the cycle for the new children and preventing the deadly pattern from claiming any more. The problem had to be kept, first of all, from getting any bigger. Subsequent events showed that action in any part affected the whole, and actually diminished the problem of the children already enmeshed.

The community group undertook to represent foster care to the community and in so doing became the nucleus of an unofficial advisory committee. They asked to begin with a detailed study of the child welfare program, including policies and procedures. How does a child come into care? Where does he come from? How is he placed for adoption? The group spared no details.

Their study was reported as it proceeded in newspaper reports of their meetings. Their public interpretation enlisted the interest of the newspaper in foster home recruitment. With growing assurance they widened their community contacts to include other agencies, the court, and key persons. More recently they have felt ready to undertake a new and very valuable role—to interpret the program's needs to the agency's own board and to offer it support and help in seeking new solutions to old problems.

Through these activities, in a community not notably "activity minded," the committee has rather quickly become one of the most consistently active sections of the Community Council. The clearest lesson of the community group's functioning is the price an agency's

children may have to pay if the agency neglects community leadership as an inherent, organized and planned function.

Taking a New Look

For the agency, no single change was more pervasive than the state of alarm the study aroused about children no longer "waiting for something to happen." As this has subsided, the agency has come to recognize that a certain amount of anxiety in this area is valuable and necessary. A child placement program seems to operate best where there is a continuing quality of urgency and recognition that time runs out on children very quickly. Consequently the adoptive program moved from the status of just one of the agency's services to its top priority service.

Surprisingly simple administrative changes made possible acceleration of the whole program. A total case load review was undertaken with the goal of a long-term plan for every child. While in some instances such planning did not change anything in a child's life, in some instances it did. And for the first group it established the existing plan as the best alternative.

Re-evaluation of all foster children for adoptive potential was initiated. Foster parents who had expressed a vague intention of adopting their boarded child "some day" were given accelerated services which led in many instances to adoption. Protective and preventive services received a new impetus. Case contacts with parents were intensified. Services in neglect situations were linked to concrete time limits in work with parents. Court action became more aggressive to free children who were abandoned or whose parents had proven not rehabilitable.

New Uses for Old Homes

The home finding program was centralized as a specialty of the best-trained staff, with dramatic results. The agency reconsidered its practices from the standpoint of their realism and practicality rather than continuing merely to conform to traditional methods and attitudes. A healthy habit of asking "Why?" developed. For example, an old policy restricting the use of local homes for local children, invoked to protect confidentiality when the community was much smaller, was recognized to be practically obsolete. The old rigidities

had to go. The great lesson of independent adoptions has for years been the fact that many new risks could be taken without dire results, and that families were taking them with or without benefit of an agency.

In the new program, no applicants were rejected until every possibility of their appropriateness for *some* child had been explored. Study of applicants in the order of need resulted in speedier placements and the overcoming of that waiting which is the largest single public relations problem placement agencies face. By trimming out practices that had become empty and ritualistic, the time required for studies was cut sharply.

Physical and social matching, racial and religious differences, were all de-emphasized. The limits of a family's flexibility with regard to such differences were explored more deliberately. Families were asked to risk accepting children who had legal obstacles to adoption to overcome, and such courageous people were found.

The New Dynamic

The most original development emerged rather spontaneously, and has had important ramifications for the agency's placement program. The agency discovered that an appreciable number of applicants always wavered between adopting children and boarding them. Some of this ambivalence is well-known: Minority and underprivileged groups fear social agencies and resist having someone "pick" their child for them; they want to "know" their child first; some families cannot immediately afford adoption, or fear the responsibility, much as they want a child, or they can support a child but cannot undertake unusual expenses such as special education or medical care. In some instances, families are not even consciously interested in adoption and discover such an interest only in a particular child.

It has been generally assumed that such ambivalence needed to be resolved before a family could be safely used for either boarding or adoption. When this was not possible, the home was usually lost as a resource.

However, it was discovered that such ambivalence, rather than being an obstacle, can actually be a key dynamic in the placement process. On a selective basis, such homes appear suited for the placement of children

who have themselves an uncertain status and are not ready for adoption—legally, developmentally, or for other reasons—or children for whom adoptive homes are scarce.

Three years of careful experimentation with this program demonstrates that enough of these placements turn into permanent homes to more than justify its use. There appears to be evidence which challenges the assumption that ambivalence in applicant families can be or always must be resolved during the intake or the study process. A far more flexible approach in evaluating applicants proved to be needed.

This approach has been conditioned by the discovery that some boarding homes were turning into adoptive homes anyway on a more or less accidental basis. It became a matter of studying the reasons why this happened, and using this knowledge to control the process.

The Old Bugaboos

The words "segmented community" loomed through the foster care study like a declaration of doom. With children of Latin ancestry and Catholic religion needing the homes and predominantly Anglo applicants of Protestant faiths needing the children, it had long seemed that a hopeless barrier kept them from ever getting together. The answer to this problem was not found in one area, nor indeed was the answer wholly found. And undoubtedly some of the solutions devised do not apply in communities having different ethnic and cultural divisions.

One answer lay in the more active seeking of adoptive homes within the group out of which the children themselves come, and in presenting this problem to that part of the community which felt a genuine concern about it. But other possibilities opened also, which needed the aggressive support of the Foster Care Committee because they were new and revolutionary for the community.

The features of Spanish children run a gamut that defies description. They are white children; their "differentness" is not physiological or racial, but is due merely to conditioning. In exploring this more deeply with applicants the agency found fears about taking Spanish children were not always based on deep prejudices. They frequently stemmed from a mental image-stereotype such families

had of a child, and were unable to imagine them as their own.

When families were asked to consider children as possible to adopt, they often responded with

Religious

hobbies

to some,

As a conse

in more

gious pre

meaningf

particular

This was

it had to

In the

sue of re

as the a

the foste

their con

homes fo

with sou

where ca

permits,

come fro

Taking

All ne

There i

everythi

discuss

for fami

out tha

has in

and pla

placeme

responsi

ment ag

is too w

dati

One c

it could

staff. F

enter th

begun t

decisi

it was f

demon

ently w

At ti

impose

curtail

This p

had of a child who would not plausibly resemble them and hence not fit into their family. When families could be reassured that Spanish children could fit into their families, it was possible to greatly accelerate their placement.

Religious preferences, prejudices, and prohibitions are even more meaningful than race to some, and entirely meaningless to others. As a consequence it proved fruitful to explore in more depth the actual meaning of a religious preference that people professed. How meaningful is a religious specification to the particular unwed mother releasing her child? This was considered along with the meaning it had to the particular church.

In the process of recasting the explosive issue of religion in adoption as a factor and not as the all-determining factor, the activity of the foster care group remains crucial. It was their concern that children not be deprived of homes for reasons that have nothing to do with sound child-raising. But an agency anywhere can only move as fast as its community permits, and the impulse for change had to come from the community itself.

Taking Risks

All new departures in practice involve risks. There is a risk in everything that is new, everything untried. This is not the place to discuss the safeguards taken to minimize risks for families and children. I want only to point out that risks have to be taken. If the gulf has in fact widened between public opinion and placement agencies, I believe that child placement agencies must accept a part of the responsibility. The public image of the placement agency as being rigid and unimaginative is too widespread to be entirely without foundation in fact.

One of the real risks for the agency was how it could undertake broad changes without new staff. For the fact is that new staff did not enter the program until results had already begun to justify support. The most painful decision that the agency had to make was that it was futile to ask for new staff without first demonstrating what the agency could do differently with what it already had.

At times the pressures of the program did impose upon the agency the need to say no, to curtail and restrict services to varying degrees. This proved entirely possible to do, with

proper community interpretation, and helped to dispel a hoary and widespread myth that a public agency can never say no. A subsidiary benefit was the way it dispelled a complacent community illusion that an agency can indefinitely meet increased demands for services without increased resources. When the community understood, it helped to enlarge the agency's resources.

Did it Pay?

In the second year after the League study, the adoptive rate more than doubled. Nearly doubled also was the turnover rate of children leaving foster care to go home. Despite an absolute increase in boarding children because of vastly increased demands for services, the ratio of children in boarding care to the total case load has dropped. Three years after the study the foster home replacement rate, that fatal index of how often children must move from one boarding home to another, has dropped to insignificance. The number of children who have been in care five and a half years or more has dropped from one-third of the cases to one-quarter. The number of children moving out of care in a year and a half or less has increased from 23 percent to 39 percent.

The temptation is great to tidy up the closets when an agency consents to be studied. The collective ego commitment is great. To admit shortcomings is never painless. Agency staff on every level would be more than human if they did not worry about being held responsible for practices that result in poor planning for children. The problems of rapport, of communication, and of understanding, are difficult. Caseworkers, and often very good ones, have a hard time understanding the mental set, or even the vocabulary, that makes sociological generalizations possible.

But only a great commitment can yield results of great value. Agencies, like the people they seek to help, can change. The healthy agency must muster the same objective insights, critical self-honesty, and willingness to change that it knows its clients need if they are to make the successful leap to maturity. As we face the challenge of the sixties, it seems clear we are going to have to do some self-treatment or society will do it for us in perhaps more painful ways.

NEGRO ADOPTIONS—CHALLENGE ACCEPTED

Mildred Hawkins

Supervisor, Placement Division
Department of Public Welfare
Lake County, Indiana

THIS is the story of how one community has tried to deal with the problem of finding adoptive parents for Negro children. We have learned much and the results, although not dramatic, have been gratifying. We know that this same problem exists in hundreds of other communities, and that some of these communities are making a real effort to grapple with the problem. This paper is presented with the hope that other agencies may benefit by what we have learned, and go even further in finding ways to meet this ever-present problem of adoption agencies.

The problem of finding homes for children of any group is not a new one. It has not been so many years since adoption agencies had difficulty in finding homes for normal, healthy white children—children who are now in great demand by adoptive parents. Adoptions have doubled in popularity in the last fifteen years. Now we find ourselves with many more homes for white children than we have children free for adoption. Most white children under the age of twelve, even those with crippling defects, can be placed in adoptive homes, if efforts are made to locate the people who can and will accept the challenge of loving and raising such a child. The "slow" white child can also be placed without too much difficulty, especially if he is able to attend public school. These handicapped white children fall into the group of "hard-to-place" children and present a problem of their own. But it soon became apparent to us that the placement of children of minority groups had to be approached as a special problem, different and separate from the problems of hard-to-place children of other kinds.

The Citizens' Committee on Negro Adoptions came into existence in Lake County, Indiana, in March, 1953. It was instituted by the Placement Division of the Lake County Department of Public Welfare. Its goal was to find homes for the increasing number of Negro children available for adoption, and also to try to discover why Negro couples

How one local public welfare agency increased the adoptive placements of Negro children.

seemed reluctant, at best, to respond to previous recruitment endeavors. The process has been a slow one; new techniques had to be found, new ideas tested, "tried and true" standards remodeled as we became increasingly cognizant of the difficulties involved in meeting the somewhat different and always difficult problem of finding adoptive homes for Negro children. The program was started at a time when relatively little was being done in this area. There were no foundation grants to help with our experimental efforts; we started from grass roots and have continued to work entirely on our own and with our own resources.

The Community Setting

Lake County, Indiana, is in the northwest corner of Indiana (near Chicago) and has a population of 514,000. Of this number, approximately 20 percent are non-white. In addition to the growth of the non-white population, Mr. Joseph D. Perfetto, of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service Office, recently estimated that there are more than 30,000 aliens in Indiana, 12,000 of whom reside in Lake County. These are people from approximately eighty-five nations of the world. Such figures will help you to understand why adoptive placements in Lake County are not easy.

The large concentration of the Negro, Mexican and Puerto Rican population is in the Indiana cities of Gary and East Chicago. Of Gary's 180,000 population, 36.1 percent is non-white, while that of East Chicago is over 20 percent non-white. East Chicago is called the King City of Steel, with 30,500 steel workers. The population of East Chicago at present is approximately 57,000, with no room for further growth. Workers have been imported from Mexico since the early 1920's, and during the last few years many have also come from Puerto Rico to try to better the conditions of their families. Many men have

come to
hoping t
which n
in the nu
Housin
influx o
result t
families
ing thei

The In

It wa
County
a study
and the
We fou
for ever
On the
homes f
Negro
realized
released
respond
homes.
in the
dren w
more N
dren fo
that m
these c
foster
basis, t
Children
infants.
Illegiti
cent of

The
been t
their h
making
their e
consider
of rais
birth (

a fee f

We
situati
munity
economi

¹ United
1951, S

CHIL

come to this region without their families, hoping to bring them at a later date—a fact which no doubt has contributed to the rise in the number of children born out of wedlock. Housing, which has not expanded with the influx of workers, has deteriorated, with the result that many of the established white families have moved to the suburbs, continuing their employment in the city.

The Increasing Need for Homes

It was in September, 1952 that the Lake County Department of Public Welfare made a study of the children available for adoption and the number of homes available for them. We found that we had about twenty homes for every healthy white child free for adoption. On the other hand, we had *no* Negro adoptive homes for more than half of the thirty-seven Negro children then free for adoption. We realized that more Negro children were being released for adoption each year, with no corresponding increase in the number of available homes. Two factors contributed to the increase in the number of children: More Negro children were being born out of wedlock, and more Negro mothers were releasing their children for adoption. It therefore became evident that more adoptive homes must be found or these children would live out their lives in foster homes or institutions. (On a national basis, the 1953 reports of the United States Children's Bureau estimates that among Negro infants alone, 30,000 to 50,000 need homes. Illegitimate babies comprise the largest percent of this number.)¹

The Negroes in our community had not been too receptive to taking children into their homes for adoption. They had been busy making a living and attempting to improve their economic and social status, and had not considered taking on the additional burden of raising children who were not theirs by birth (despite the fact that we do not charge a fee for our adoption services). At least, this was the assumption of the agency.

We decided to take a new look at the situation. After all, the Negroes in our community had made great strides socially and economically, and much had been accomplished

in the past few years in integrating the Negro into community life. Surely there were families in this area who had achieved to the point where they could consider a family through adoption. But how were they to be made aware of the need, and how stimulated to want to adopt and to take some positive action in that direction? We decided the first problem was for us to start the ball rolling, but that real accomplishment must come from the Negroes themselves.

We had already begun to realize that the initiative and even demanding pressure which we had learned to expect from white adoptive parents was not to be forthcoming in the case of the Negro applicant. And, as Lois Pettit has pointed out in a recent article, "Essentially the difference between the Negro and white applicant is that the latter carries some reasonable expectation of acceptance of his application, while the Negro applicant consciously or unconsciously expects to be rejected."² He may have had previous negative experience with the law and public agencies, and he asks himself (and often the worker) if this is worth another rejection. We had to realize that "The potential adoptive parent's own desire to be a parent is the motivation we must seek, strengthen and mobilize. He (not the child) is our client at this point."³

Interpreting Adoption to the Community

Then, too, there was the tremendous problem of community interpretation. "Explaining adoption to the community is complicated by largely negative community attitudes toward dependency, certain types of behavior and social breakdown in general, especially when they appear in minority groups."⁴ In our efforts to arouse community enthusiasm, or at least to try to overcome apathy, the attitudes of the social workers themselves were important. It was hard not to feel hostile and antagonistic toward the people who exhibited indifference or negativism toward their efforts

¹ Lois Pettit, "Some Observations on the Negro Culture in the United States," *Journal of the National Association of Social Workers*, (July, 1960), p. 107.

² Report, *Joint Recruitment Project for Minority Adoptive Homes*, March 1956 to June 1959, Marjorie L. Faraday, Director. Distributed by Children's Home Society of California, Los Angeles, Calif.

³ Michael Schapiro, *A Study of Adoption Practice*, Vol. III, Child Welfare League of America, 1957, p. 49.

¹ United States Children's Bureau, *Adoption of Children*, 1951, Statistical Series No. 14, 1953.

and failed to provide homes for children who would otherwise be denied this opportunity. The worker must come to grips with his own feelings before he can convince people of a minority group that he accepts and understands them.

With all of this in mind, the director and the supervisor of the Placement Division of the agency sought out leaders of the Negro community and invited them to meet together on March 11, 1953. The response was enthusiastic, and from this meeting developed the Citizen's Committee on Negro Adoptions. This committee then expanded, with sub-committees, such as the Interpretation Committee and the Resource Committee. The committee consisted of a minister, several housewives, a doctor, a real estate man, an insurance man, a school teacher, the wife of a local newspaper editor, the head of the Urban League, and other representative people in the community. The insurance man saw a personal reason for wanting to serve on the committee. It would be an additional opportunity for him to sell life insurance if he could help find adoptive homes. After all, what was wrong with this motive? We had no fault to find with life insurance for people who could afford it and if, through his efforts, one home was found for a child without parents, then this insurance man would have been a valuable member of the committee—for a child had found parents!

Much time was spent on interpretation to the community and on recruitment of adoptive homes. From April until June of 1953, an intensive campaign was carried on to recruit Negro adoptive homes. A series of articles and pictures was published by local newspapers. Thirty-one spot announcements for radio transmission were written by members of the committee. These were used by two local radio stations at times when housewives would be listening while doing their housework. The announcements were kept simple and short. For example:

"You don't have to be a Joe Louis or a Jackie Robinson to adopt children. Many Negro children need kindly homes and loving parents *now*—and kindness and love are two things that really count at the Department of Public Welfare. Apply *now* for your little boy or girl. Call TU 2-9341 *today*, or stop at the office at 400 Broadway, the next time you go that way."

"The Negro man who works next to me at the mill told me that he and his wife would like to have children, but have had none in their ten years of married life. When I suggested they apply at the Welfare Department, he wondered if a man with a less than sixth grade education would be considered. Later he spoke to a welfare worker, who took his application and the home was studied. Now this couple has a five-year-old son of their very own. There are no real obstacles. Negro couples interested in children should explore their interest in adoption with the caseworker assigned to that job at the Lake County Department of Public Welfare, 400 Broadway, Gary, Indiana. For further information, call Mrs. _____ at TU 2-9342 for an appointment."

The committee also wrote and put on a live fifteen-minute radio skit called "According to Statistics—OR—It Ain't Necessarily So." The skit clearly portrayed the need for adoptive homes. A Speakers' Bureau, composed of members of the committee, also gave many speeches to various group meetings. Letters were sent to organizations, stating the problems and needs and offering the services of the bureau. The entire placement staff of the agency was briefed on material to use in making contacts with the public in regard to adoption. During the months of June and July, 1953, twenty-one applications were filed. Eight of these became approved homes after the social study was made. This may sound like a very small number, but we considered it tremendous. In 1953, seventeen Negro children were placed.

Due to staff shortage and lack of direction, the Citizen's Committee on Negro Adoptions was not reactivated until October 1954, during which period there was a lag in the number of Negro applications. Efforts were then increased, and mayors of the three largest cities in the county were persuaded to issue the following proclamation to the local newspapers:

City of _____ (Gary, Hammond or E. Chicago)
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS, There is a large number of Negro boys and girls in Lake County who have been deprived of childhood's birthright—a permanent, happy home—through no fault of their own; and

WHEREAS, These children have been placed in child care institutions and foster family boarding homes and, while these child care facilities are

beneficial, stability to happy home to a family with their

WHERE the nation homes should children they, too,

WHERE of these homes should pose of c

WHERE promotion dren in c ment of "Operati of Nov greater Negro c permane

Now,

designat Novemb TION W

Dated

Work

During tions w proved necessary plicant "I don or not wanted given the ne parent muniti We ta a child involv to rea positio discov plicant course Negro deve

beneficial, they cannot give the happiness and stability that can be derived from the permanent, happy home life that is part of legally belonging to a family just as other children who are living with their natural parents; and

WHEREAS, All children are the real wealth of the nation, these children in need of adoptive homes should be given the same concern as other children of the community. Like all other children, they, too, are our hope for the future; and

WHEREAS, It is therefore fitting that the needs of these unfortunate children in need of adoptive homes should have a week set aside for the purpose of calling the community's attention to their need for a happy home life; and

WHEREAS, The Citizen's Committee on the promotion of Adoptive Homes for Negro Children in conjunction with the Lake County Department of Public Welfare, has launched a program, "Operation of Happiness," beginning the week of November 14 to November 20, 1954, to obtain greater interest among our citizens in adopting Negro children who unfortunately are without a permanent family life.

Now, THEREFORE, I, _____, Mayor of _____ City of Lake County, do hereby designate the period from November 14 to November 20, 1954, as "NEGRO CHILDREN ADOPTION WEEK."

Dated this 12th day of November, 1954.

Mayor, City of _____

Work with the Applicants

During this campaign, thirty-five applications were received and twenty-nine were approved after study. However, we found it necessary to do much work with our applicants during the study. Some would say, "I don't know if I am doing the right thing or not, for I always thought that if God wanted me to have children, he would have given them to me." Of course, we emphasized the need of those children who did not have parents and the responsibility of the community to provide such parents if possible. We talked of the joy children can bring into a childless home, along with the responsibilities involved. We found, too, that it was up to us to reach out to these applicants and to show positive acceptance of them as people. It was discovered, too, that, although white applicants might see many people during the course of an adoptive study, it was helpful to Negro applicants to have contact with, and develop a relationship with, only one case-

worker. It was a matter of education, both for us and for the applicants, and it took time before couples gradually began to let themselves be interested in taking children into their homes on a permanent basis—something some of them had wanted for a long time.

We also found that many Negro couples were very limiting in the kind of child they desired. A prominent restriction was that of color. "Some Negro mothers are outspoken in their preference for the lighter-skinned child with 'good' hair (not frizzy or woolly)."⁵ They sometimes wanted only a child whose skin would not be darker than that of either parent. When the question of color arose, though, it provided a rare opportunity for the worker to offer understanding and to discuss more freely with the client his feelings about this subject. Sometimes, too, applicants wanted only a little girl or a child of a certain age. These barriers were often broken down when the situation of *one* particular child was presented to them.

There was again a lull in the activity of the committee; in 1956 they were called together again and have been constantly and consistently active since that time. On December 1, 1957, a Negro social worker with one year of graduate work in the field of social work was hired by the agency to work with the Citizen's Committee in Gary and to organize another such committee in another part of the county. He has kept the Gary committee active and has organized a committee to serve Hammond and East Chicago. While most of the response has come from Gary, we have been able to place a few Negro children in other parts of the county, so the effort has been worthwhile.

Techniques for Stimulating Interest

The following techniques have been used to stimulate interest in adoption of Negro children and to inform the community of the increasing need for adoptive homes:

Letters have been sent to ministers of the community, asking that they talk about this need from the pulpit and give out brochures prepared by the agency or committee.

Letters and statements of requirements were

⁵ Case illustration included in Rose Cooper Thomas, *Mother-Daughter Relationships and Social Behavior*, Social Work Series 21, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C., 1955, quoted in Lois Pettit, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

mailed to pastors of churches with Negro congregations in other cities with large Negro populations (after writing to that local County Department and obtaining consent to take the applications and make the necessary studies).

The Speakers' Bureau continued to function as needed.

Posters were prepared and placed on buses. These were recently replaced with very attractive, commercially prepared posters which were purchased by the committee.

A film, *Eddie Gets A New Home*, has been procured twice, and is excellent for this purpose. It was shown to many groups of people.⁶

Posters were prepared for places of business and placed by members of the committee. One committee member insisted that a poster be placed in the Internal Revenue Office at a spot where people being interviewed would have to face it.

Thirty spot announcements were prepared, presented to local radio stations, and used freely at different times during the day.

Newspaper articles and pictures were prepared and used freely by the press.

Satisfied adoptive parents have written articles for the "Voice of the People" column of local daily papers, telling of their happy and satisfying experiences with their own adopted families.

One agency worker created a very effective window display, consisting of Negro dolls with appropriate posters, pleading for homes for these children who do not have parents who can care for them. This display has been used many times in prominent windows of downtown stores and has been shown at gatherings of Negro people and at meetings.

The committee has put on teas with an interesting program regarding adoption—usually followed by small group discussions.

The committee put on a style show at which clothes were modeled by adults and children, with the announcer working in such phrases as "This is a mother and daughter ensemble. If you do not have a daughter or wish another daughter, why don't you get in touch with Mrs. _____ at the Welfare Department and see if there is a child available for you? This poster will tell you where to go and whom to call."

A panel discussion was tried, with members of the committee, an adoptive couple, and an agency staff member participating. All heads of block units were invited by the Urban League.

Articles advertising our need for Negro homes have been published in Negro newspapers in Chicago.

⁶This film may be obtained from Michael Schapiro, now area supervisor of the Children's Home Society of California. Write to him at 897 Hyde Street, San Francisco, California. The rental fee is \$15 for one week.

Social studies are sent to the State Adoption Resource Exchange for children we are not able to place, and adoptive home studies for couples whose specifications we cannot meet.

Couples who have previously adopted children and who are making good parents are contacted to see if they might be interested in an additional child. We do not always wait for them to come to us, although we certainly have not tried to overpersuade them to take other children if they are not interested.

The large percentage of Negro children placed are born out of wedlock. We realize that we are doing a "mopping up" job at the point of placement. The real problems of why children have to be placed and how they become available would constitute another paper. However, the children who are available for adoption have the right to an adequate substitute home if such can be found. As a placement division, we are doing our best to supply the best possible homes for these children.

More Negro girls and women are giving up their children for adoption with each passing year. This may in part, at least, be due to the fact that the Negro community has not previously been aware of the need to adopt. Now they find they cannot keep unrelated children in their homes without being questioned about the legality of such a situation. Too, they are not eligible for help from public agencies without a license to board children. In many situations where a child has been in a licensed home for several years, and where the foster parents saw no need to make any changes, agency workers have been able to interpret to them the need for permanent status of the child in their home, or the possibility that the child might be placed elsewhere if a suitable adoptive home could be found. Through such interpretation, the foster parents have realized the importance of making the child their own, legally, and have instituted adoptive proceedings with the approval and help of the agency.

The Question of Standards

The question of having more flexible standards for homes of minority groups always rears its head. This problem has already been given some attention in this paper, but at this point I should like to explain how—if and when different requirements seemed indicated—they were and are decided upon.

The decision to place a child in a particular home is made by an adoption committee. This committee is composed of the adoptive consultant, the supervisor of the Foster Home Division, the worker carrying the case of the child and her supervisor, and the Placement Division head. Each home is carefully studied and submitted to the Indiana State Department of Public Welfare for its approval. There is sometimes the decision of whether it is better for a child to be placed permanently in a somewhat "sub-standard" home or to live the rest of his life in a foster home—never legally belonging and never being entitled to Social Security or any inheritance in case of death of the foster parents.

We have never relaxed our standards to include adoptive parents who had nothing to give a child but a name, nor have we relaxed to the point of endangering the life or morals of a child. We have tried to find warm, loving people who, though they may not have had much formal education nor much to give in a material way, have a place in their hearts for a lonely, unwanted child. If we had homes with higher standards (as sometimes we do) we would use them; but in the absence of such homes, we feel that it is better for a child to be loved and wanted by someone who can give some guidance than to grow up with no one really caring about him.

In view of the above, we do not necessarily require that a Negro couple be unable to have their own children. We will place more than two children in the same home if we feel the couple can handle and love that many children, and have the finances to support them and room in the home for them. (Incidentally, we have never placed more than four children in the same home.) We may place a young child or an infant with people who exceed the age at which babies are placed with white couples. We assess the ability of the couple to handle a *little* money, rather than emphasizing the need for what might be considered an adequate income. We do not insist that the mother figure give up her job and stay at home all of the time, if she can make adequate arrangements for the care of the child while she is out of the home.

There could be much argument about relaxing the above usual requirements, but when the choice is between having parents

who are your very own or living in a foster home or institution the rest of your life, we feel justified in these decisions.

The Progress Made

The following adoptive placements of Negro children have been made by the Lake County Department of Public Welfare since the organization of the Citizens' Committee on Negro Adoptions: Seventeen placements were made in 1953 and in 1954, and twenty-one in 1955 and in 1956. In 1957, thirty-four placements were made, in 1958, thirty-five and in 1959 (the year of the steel strike), thirty-one. In 1960, from January to June, nineteen placements were made.

Thus we have a total of 195 Negro children placed in adoptive homes in the last seven and a half years. Of this number, two children have had to be removed from their adoptive homes because of lack of acceptance by the adoptive parents. Most of the children placed are under two years old. However, children from two to eight years often find homes. By placing our infants, the older group gradually diminishes. In other words, if more children are made free for adoption at an early age, we will have fewer children reaching the age of eight in foster homes.

While the above figures are encouraging and we feel that much has been accomplished in finding homes for these 195 Negro children, still we realize that we must never relax our efforts. Each year the number of Negro children available for adoption grows. At present we have in Lake County forty-four Negro children who are legally free for adoption, and forty-three more who will soon be legally free, making a total of eighty-seven children who will need homes as soon as possible.

Every effort must be put forth each year to increase community resources through interpretation and stimulation of interest. Children of minority groups must not be neglected and we cannot afford to give up on a single child until we have tried every possible resource. "We need to take a positive approach as we interpret adoption. If we really believe that adoption is a good thing for everyone involved, let's say so. If we really believe that adoptive parents are pretty wonderful people, let's let them know it."⁷ *It can be done!*

⁷ Marjorie L. Faraday, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS



2960 Broadway
New York 27, N. Y.

for the parent, teacher, social-worker: three outstanding titles

A Primer of Social Casework

ELIZABETH NICHOLDS

This valuable contribution to the literature of social casework is designed specifically for the untrained, nonprofessional or volunteer social workers and their directors. In simple, nontechnical language, Miss Nicholds surveys the areas of social work open to these people and gives explicit instructions on how to conduct interviews, how to set up case records, and how to evaluate the data obtained. Among the areas of casework considered are public welfare, child welfare, the problems of adolescence, the retarded child, the physically handicapped, and the aged. *Price: \$4.50.*

Teaching the Mentally Retarded Child

NATALIE PERRY

In this highly useful book, the author offers many practical suggestions for the training of the severely retarded child. A teacher with over twenty years' experience with mentally retarded children, Miss Perry shows how the home, the school, and the community can work together to encourage self-expression and self-care in severely retarded or trainable children. She includes a list of general principles relating to the retarded, a number of realistic school programs, and ideas for items the children can make. This book will prove a valuable guide to all those who work with mentally retarded children. *Price: \$6.00.*

Directory of Social and Health Agencies of New York City, 1960-1961

EDITED BY KATHRYN SEWNY

This revised and up-to-date edition of the *Directory* provides comprehensive but succinct information on over 1,100 social and health agencies in New York City. Both governmental and voluntary organizations are included. The *Directory* lists the agencies alphabetically and by function and is cross-indexed to provide quick and convenient reference. Prepared under the Direction of the Committee on Information Services of the Community Council of Greater New York, the *Directory* upholds the tradition of accuracy and completeness that has made it an indispensable guide for social workers. *Price: \$8.50*

CHILD
WELFARE

We
Bu
wel
a c
the
con

1. COMM

CHILD
Practice,
sable sta
that fills
which mo
doubt tha
clear suc
social wo
children a
will I am
ment in
cannot in
allied he
able in c
sponsibil
laboratio
tempted
the scop
lay part
terest an
field (w
the cou
and II),
publicat
and val

For t
stateme
poses. A
"For th
Service
Public W
answers
rector a
proval o
fare tha
tressed

* Child
lished by

CHIL

CHILD WELFARE AS A FIELD OF SOCIAL WORK PRACTICE: A Discussion

We have invited critical comment on the statement prepared by the U. S. Children's Bureau and Child Welfare League of America which describes the field of child welfare and identifies its distinctive characteristics.* In this issue we are presenting a discussion by an outstanding public welfare administrator, an eminent social work theoretician, and a leader in the development of social policy. We welcome further comments and other points of view.

1. COMMENTS by *James R. Dummison* Commissioner of Welfare City of New York

CHILD Welfare as a Field of Social Work Practice, is one of those rare and indispensable statements in the field of social work that fills a variety of needs far beyond those which motivated its preparation. There is no doubt that we have needed for a long time a clear succinct statement defining the aspects of social work practice that relate specifically to children and youth. Our schools of social work will I am sure, make creative use of this statement in curriculum study and planning. I cannot imagine any of the social agencies and allied helping professions not finding it valuable in clarifying further areas of specific responsibility and new areas for improved collaboration. For many of us who have attempted to interpret, in a meaningful way, the scope and content of child welfare to our lay partners, and to those citizens whose interest and support we would recruit for the field (without benefit of a bibliography from the courses in Social Services to Children, I and II), the pamphlet more than justifies its publication. These, I believe, are the obvious and valuable purposes it will serve.

For the public welfare administrator, the statement will serve an additional set of purposes. As I read it, I kept marking sections "For the Budget Director" or "For the Civil Service Commission" or "For our Board of Public Welfare." I know of no statement that answers better the questions of a budget director and the "why" of a request for approval of a program development in child welfare than an administrator's own answer, buttressed by the simple but sound interpretative

material in this pamphlet. I cannot imagine a Civil Service Commission, after reading this statement, failing to understand why the body of knowledge, understanding, and skills of professional social work training—rather than just an AB degree—are a sought-after prerequisite for child welfare workers. It should further support the position of those public welfare administrators who continue to insist that skillful supervision is an essential ingredient of child welfare practice, and that the quality of supervision needed cannot be assured alone by a seniority qualification. In my judgment this pamphlet can be used effectively to improve and strengthen the quality of child welfare service in the public agency. I would hope that every public welfare administrator "reads, learns, and inwardly digests" the entire statement, and uses it with those in government who affect the professional destiny of his child welfare program.

I welcome this statement also for its usefulness in the further development of an in-service training and staff development program—particularly in child welfare although it has unlimited usefulness for staff training in public assistance. Obviously, all public welfare personnel giving direct services to families and children will not have the benefit of professional training in a school of social work in the foreseeable future. This statement clearly identifies the content of child welfare services, and will substantially assist the public agency in strengthening practice of its less trained personnel.

Once again, by implication at least, public child welfare is having pointed up for it its

* *Child Welfare as a Field of Social Work Practice*, published by the Child Welfare League of America, 1960.

responsibility for participating in the professional training of personnel for its program. The statement properly lists as part of the social work education requirements for practice in the child welfare field "direct living experience in the care and guidance of children," "field work experience," "teaching material . . . [that maintains] an appropriate balance . . . of cases of children with problems requiring child welfare services." The public agency has rich resources to offer to the schools of social work for each of these educational requirements. If child welfare under public auspices is to fulfill its part of the mission of child welfare set forth in this statement, and I believe it must, it has the obligation to share in the professional preparation of the workers to do the job. The pamphlet makes a real contribution to public welfare in restating its responsibility for the realization of these ends.

I wish the statement had included more emphasis on child welfare's shared responsibility for reconstructing the environment in which many children are obliged to live. True,

under the section on community organization this responsibility is set forth. But I wish the authors had spelled out this function of child welfare workers in the same detail as they defined the place of casework in child welfare practice. We have properly emphasized evaluation of causative factors of child and youth maladjustment that are in the family and in the home. We have not emphasized sufficiently, I believe, the causative factors of maladjustment that are outside the home. As the statement clearly indicates, "to a large degree, a child's development is influenced by conditions and relationships in the family, neighborhood, and community. . . ." Unless our child welfare workers are trained to place the spotlight on neighborhood and community conditions and militantly participate in social action to remove them, work with the parents and children will be much less effective.

The statement is a significant contribution to child welfare and has particular meaning to the public welfare administrator. I hope every one of us reads it and uses it.

2. COMMENTS by *Rev. Swithin Bowers, O.M.I.*

Director, University of Ottawa
School of Social Welfare

CHILD Welfare as a Field of Social Work Practice provides, in concise outline, a descriptive summary of the functions undertaken by the child welfare services, the problems with which these services deal, and the skills and knowledge considered requisite for social work practice in them. The whole serves a good and useful purpose, and certainly justifies the doing. It should not be considered as a final and definitive document, but as an excellent working paper open to further revision and elaboration.

One might have hoped that some explicit recognition would have been given in the study to the problems that arise out of acute *anomie* and normlessness. There is much to suggest that the cumulative displacement in the social structure of standards and moral values by urge responses tends to the development of the anomic child, conditioned to deviant and even anarchic social behaviour. MacIver is one who has written incisively of the social sequelae that follow the anomic person, whom

he describes as "spiritually sterile," derisive of values, having no faith but the philosophy of denial, and living "on the thin line of sensation between no future and no past."¹

This omission may be related to the lack, in the study, of any clear identification of the obligation of the child welfare service to be concerned with the spiritual and religious development of the child, even though it is said that "the agency's responsibility for meeting the needs of children touches on all aspects of the child's life." (*Child Welfare as a Field of Social Work Practice*, page 8.) This lack is regrettable, particularly in the clear context that is established of agencies' responsibilities to assume or to supplement the parental role. The seeds of spiritual growth are sown through the development of trust and faith in relationship with parents or parental figures. Whatever spiritual and moral values are incorporated

¹ R. M. MacIver, *The Ramparts We Guard*, Macmillan, N. Y., 1950, p. 84.

into the child's life, the same reprehensive parent.

The level that which and need unifying about ne mentarie Depend characteristic to ence and of the l pendence "needs" istics, and inter as thou None o explored the ma some co tivity a even as For exa of repr are they of feelin

Extending the necessary social tempt the kno

3. CONC

THIS way c stitute pressin has be report thinkin that at least from

into the child's ego ideal come mainly through the same source. Being a half-parent is as reprehensible in an agency as in a natural parent.

The least satisfactory section of the study is that which professes to deal with the nature and needs of the child. Actually there is no unifying concept of nature and very little about needs. Instead we are given brief commentaries on certain so-called characteristics. Dependency is noted as one of the chief characteristics of childhood, but there is no reference to the parallel drive toward self-dependence and autonomy, nor to the establishment of the basic pattern of the dependence-independence balance,—one of the important "needs" of the child. Other named characteristics,—maturation, adaptability, sensitivity and intensity of feeling,—are presented almost as though these were specific to childhood. None of them are adequately and critically explored. To raise but one question among the many that come to mind—is there not some confusion in an assumption that sensitivity and intensity of feeling are greater, or even as great, in childhood than in adulthood? For example, the observable tears in the face of reproof or rebuff are not the feelings. Nor are they a satisfactory measure of the intensity of feeling.

Extensive work has been done on identifying the "knowledge topics" that are considered necessary or desirable for the formation of the social worker engaged in child welfare. No attempt has been made to distinguish between the knowledge that should be acquired in pro-

fessional education and that which should be gained from accumulated experience. Any such differentiation would probably need to be related much more to depth of knowledge than to its sweep. The knowledge content as given might, in some degree, be expected of all social workers engaged in direct service, and certainly should be expected of those in the family services as well as those in child welfare.

It seems quite significant that in the concluding statement on the study's implications for social work education, reference is made to "the training of child welfare workers." Almost continuously in the reading of the study one gets the impression that it is pervaded by the wish, perhaps unconscious, for a professional and educational specialization in child welfare. Many of us believe that to train "child welfare workers" would be a retrograde step. We can, however, identify with those who want to ensure that social work education prepare as adequately as is possible for social work practice in the child welfare field. With the explicit educational recommendations made there should be no serious quarrel; they have significance in the preparation of all caseworkers and all group workers. Additional study opportunities are suggested for "students who plan to practice in the field of child welfare." (page 31) But social work education must also prepare those whose only plan is to practice social work and who *may*, either after graduation or at some later time, practice it in the field of child welfare. These are many; child welfare and children need them, as and when they come.

3. COMMENTS by *Norris E. Class*

Professor, School of Social Work and Faculty
Associate, Youth Studies Center, University of
Southern California

THIS pamphlet at the least makes a four-way contribution. One, its very presence constitutes a means of calling attention to a very pressing professional problem that heretofore has been inadequately met. Two, its excellent report writing communicates the collective thinking and feeling of the various groups that have struggled with the problem. (At least the next discussion will not have to start from scratch!) Three, the broadened concep-

tion of what is included in child welfare augers well for future planning—although it seemed to stress, perhaps, dependency at the expense of social deviance. Four, the fullness of the statement reflects not only the achievement but also areas of non-achievement, both of which are necessary to chart a course of "next steps." So, within the limits of space allotted to me, I should like to propose one next step—a step I believe to be very much in order if

the excellent start that has already been made is to be exploited as fully as it deserves.

This next step is the matter of determining whether we should continue to use *needs* as a basis for building—systematizing—social work practice. Is not *needs* a fairly shaky and unsatisfactory “unit” of practice formulation? Social workers like to stress the value of interdisciplinary approach. Well, both the psychologist and social scientist find much that is poor in going along with the so-called needs basis of human behavior or human action. One particular difficulty is that the list of needs seems to be almost explosively expansive. Once a scrutinizing process is instituted, needs develop in a geometric manner while the method of meeting needs proceeds, at best, in an arithmetic fashion. The resulting gap between met and unmet needs offers a professional disservice by contributing to the development of a feeling compounded by a sense of being overwhelmed and of defeat; it may also contribute to a vocational masochism from which some practitioners may suffer.

It might be noted in passing that other vocational groups have not escaped the needs-listing approach. In an excellent paper, “Are Basic Needs Ultimate,” Dorothy Lee, a professor of anthropology, makes this interesting observation of her own group playing the game of needs-listing:

“When we found that the original list of basic needs or drives was inadequate, we, like the psychologist tried to solve the difficulty by adding on a list of social and psychic needs. . . . When the list proved faulty all we had to do was add to the list. We have now such need as that for novelty, for escape from reality, for security, for emotional response. We have primary needs, or drives, and secondary needs, and we have secondary needs playing the role of primary needs. The endless process of adding and correcting is not an adequate improvement; neither does the occasional substitution of a totality of needs, for a list of needs, get at the root of the trouble. *Where so much elaboration and revision is necessary, I suspect that the original unit itself must be at fault. . . .*¹ (Italics mine)

The second difficulty with a needs approach is that it tends to obscure the nature and place

¹ In *Personality in Nature, Society and Culture*, Eds. Clyde Kluckhohn and Henry A. Murray. Alfred A. Knopf, N. Y., 1956, p. 336.

of *value* in conceptual thinking about human behavior. Certainly needs emerge as much from a given cultural value system as they do from one's biological make-up or constitution. Failure to see needs at least in part as derivative from the culture may well result in fallacious judgment as to professional action or operations. Further, values such as “love,” “a warm family life,” “wholesome adventure or experimentation,” or “reasonable limits” deal with a totality, or an aggregate of activity. This is in contrast to needs, which have a way of becoming “fragmentized” into untreatable bits. Thus, a concern for, and an educational working through, of what is involved in certain selected values for all children should in the long run be more directive of professional behavior than a listing of a thousand free-floating needs that are not anchored realistically in the culture.

In connection with the importance of going beyond needs as a basis of practice, it is encouraging to note that Irving Weissman in the Curriculum Study volume relating to teaching and learning of social welfare policies and services calls attention to the necessity for replacing *needs* with the concept of *problem* as a basis for teaching and learning in this area of social work education. In writing of the concept of problem, he states:

“A proper use of this concept [i.e., problem] requires that it be clearly distinguished from the term ‘need’ with which it is often confused. In the dictionary sense, a need is a normal state of excitation to which all living things are subject. Its nature is inferred from the behavior of the person. It may or may not become manifest as a problem. Whether it does will depend upon whether and to what extent it cannot be satisfied or met. . . . The problem may or may not be a social problem. It is not a social problem if, presumptively or as a matter of fact, it can be worked out with available resources institutionalized in society. It is a social problem if this is not the case and if this fact poses a threat to some value or functional requirement of society. . . .”²

Another next step might be mentioned briefly. It is a reconsideration of the soundness of trying to prepare a multi-focused statement. From the introduction of the statement

² Irving Weissman, Volume XII, *Social Welfare Policy and Services in Social Work Education*, Council on Social Work Education, N. Y., 1959, p. 32.

the original objective would appear to be the preparation of something for the field of social work education. Apparently as the project proceeded, there was a modification of this original goal and the assumption of a responsibility to prepare a statement aimed in four different directions: (1) The social work educator, (2) children's service agency staff, (3) personnel in other social agencies dealing with children, and (4) the citizenry generally. Worthy as this intent may be, it is obvious that the net result of increasing the magnitude of a focus is to decrease its intensity upon any one spot. *Generale nihil certi implicat*, which freely translated, means, "When a thing is too general it loses its certainty—its utility."



READERS' FORUM

Children Who Do Not Cry

To the Editor:

I read with great interest the article on "Children Who Do Not Cry" (CHILD WELFARE, April 1960). I thought you would be interested in how I used Mrs. Emmons' and Mr. Jacobucci's article a few days after it was received here.

It happened that I was carrying a copy of your magazine with me on a day when I was involved in the pre-placement home visit of a two-and-a-half-year-old girl with her new adoptive parents. That afternoon while Mary was napping, we spent about an hour and a half reading and discussing your article with the adoptive parents. Although they are not professionally trained in social work or other of the behavioral sciences, they are an astute couple and well able to understand emotions and the makeup of a child's life. As we went through the article, we compared the children mentioned with the child they were receiving. I talked with them about how they might expect some of these reactions and we came to conclusions as to how they might handle them.

Then the placement, two days later, at which time Mary took the move with no show of emotion at leaving the foster parents with whom she had lived since birth, just as though

she were going for another ride as she had some thirteen times before.

Now, three weeks later, there have been some interesting developments. First the family noticed that when she went to sleep the first night she seemed completely relaxed. She was not interested in having them help her dress or undress, nor help her to eat. She did not want to be held or cuddled. She had few smiles, but she was able to express some displeasure and to cry under slight disciplinary action.

In the first week after placement, she began to relate to the new adoptive mother, mostly by just being around her, but did not allow the adoptive father or the grandfather in the home to pick her up or get too close to her. She was able to allow neighbor women to hold her, or to give her a new hairdo.

In the second week, she seemed a little more comfortable in allowing the men in the household to hold her, but she showed no affection. She continued to be somewhat independent in dressing and in eating. At the end of the second week, one afternoon she suddenly walked up to the adoptive father and gave him a great big kiss. After that she wanted to be with him all of the time. She loved to be held and rocked by him. The following Monday, she met the grandfather at the door, climbed up into his lap, and thoroughly enjoyed his company. About this same time, she began to say to the adoptive mother, "Dress me." When they suggested that she could dress herself, she would sit down on the floor and say, "No. Mommy dress me." She would help appropriately but she refused to be completely independent. Also, at about the same time she began to ask the adoptive mother to feed her. She would start to eat and then put her hands in her lap and say, "Mommy feed me," which Mommy proceeded to do.

This is the end of the story to date. I think you can see, however, how thrilled we were to have your article to use with this couple. They have been well prepared for these events. They understand that it is Mary's own need to regress and they are not threatened by it, nor do they feel that she will not begin to grow again.

MILTON C. HANSON
Social Worker
Lutheran Welfare Society of Wisconsin

BOOK NOTES

The Self-Image of the Foster Child, by Eugene A. Weinstein, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1960, 80 pages, \$2.00.

This is a stimulating piece of research. It deals with an area in which there has been practically no previous research—the foster child's concept of his identity. The method is one of active collaboration between a researcher and casework practitioners, with data obtained directly from interviews with children in foster home care. Finally, the approach is from a sociological as well as a psychoanalytic perspective.

The study is of children under the care of the Chicago Child Care Society. It was conducted in 1954-1955, when the author held a Russell Sage Foundation residency in that agency. The purpose was to learn of the impact on the child of the process of foster home placement, with particular emphasis on the way the child defines the placement situation and his role in it. How does the child answer such questions as "Who am I? Where am I? Why am I here? What is going to happen to me?" The author interviewed sixty-one children five years of age and older, who had been in placement at least one year. The schedule, used as a guide in interviewing, included questions designed to elicit the child's concepts of his relationship with natural parents, foster parents, and the agency. The caseworker rated the children on a scale of total well-being, and these ratings were correlated with material obtained in the interviews with the children.

There are three major highlights among the findings: 1) Continuing contact with the natural parents is important for the child's adjustment in placement. 2) The child's predominant family identification is an important factor in his well-being in placement. On the average, the children who identified predominantly with their natural parents had the highest well-being ratings. Among the children identifying predominantly with foster parents, those who got along best were the ones whose natural parents visited regularly. The children with the lowest well-being rating were those with mixed identification, and those with foster parent identification whose natural parents did not visit them. 3) Adequate conceptions of the meaning of foster status and of the role of the agency are important for

the child's well-being. These conceptions most frequently develop under circumstances in which the agency plays a more direct role with the child.

The author repeatedly points to the need for more definitive research and warns against drawing conclusions from tentative findings. This is preliminary research and the sample studied is small, but provocative questions are raised for practice and further research.

All of us who work with foster children are concerned with their problems in establishing their identity. A method of obtaining information directly from the children is a major contribution of this study. One is impressed with the necessity of scrutinizing a constellation of factors contributing to or hindering a child's well-being, their correlations, and how one factor may modify another. In general, the research indicates that the children with the greatest sense of well-being were those who saw their natural parents regularly and those who had the clearest understanding of their status. The agency is the bridge between the children and their two sets of parents, and is also the source of clarifying information. We, as caseworkers, are challenged to play a more direct and active role in seeing that the child has his parents if possible, and in any case, an adequate understanding of his status, as foundations on which to build a healthy concept of himself.

MARY ELLEN HOFFMAN
Director of Casework
Family and Children's Service
Pittsburgh, Pa.

When a Parent Is Mentally Ill: What to Say to Your Child, by Helene S. Arnstein. New York: Child Study Association of America, Inc., 9 E. 89 St., New York 28, N. Y., 1960, 46 pp., 50¢.

This is a pamphlet designed to help the child whose parent is mentally ill and has to be hospitalized. Addressed to the parent or person who has the responsibility of caring for the children, it deals with the questions the children may ask, and those questions that may go unasked, as well. There are specific illustrations of what to do and what to say to children of all ages—preschool, pre-adolescent and adolescent.

The simply stated and specific guides to dealing with the anxieties and questions of

children
children
to explain
help to
workers in
providing
the positive
mental ill

The Leader

Among
offered to
visory Se
and spe
acquisiti

The C
Mary O
Training
tion, Ch
"why" o

Childr
and Ric
Press, N
CHILD V

Inserv
Experim
by Edw

CLASS

Classi
minimu
publicati
panied

CASEW
diate op
compet
work s
with or
or fami
lated t
Fring
tion In
Ave, L

LOS A
casewo
in expa
fare a
cluding
ried p

CHIL

children reflect understanding both of how children feel and of how difficult it is for adults to explain. The pamphlet could be of great help to foster parents, houseparents and social workers in children's institutions and agencies providing foster family care who may be in the position of having to explain a parent's mental illness to a child.

The League's Lending Library

Among the League's services is the privilege offered to members and subscribers to the Advisory Service of borrowing books, pamphlets and special reports. A sampling of recent acquisitions follows:

The Caseworker . . . Person with Value, by Mary Overholt Peters. Series on Services and Training III, American Public Welfare Association, Chicago, 1960. 26 pp. 75¢. Portrays the "why" of the caseworker and casework service.

Children in Need of Parents, by Henry Maas and Richard Engler, Jr. Columbia University Press, N. Y., 1959. 462 pp. \$7.50. (Reviewed in CHILD WELFARE, Sept. 1960.)

Inservice Training and Reduced Workloads—Experiments in a State Department of Welfare, by Edwin J. Thomas and Donna L. McLeod. Rus-

sell Sage Foundation, N. Y., 1960. 130 pp. \$2.50. Studies conducted in the Michigan State Department of Social Welfare which relate to whether staff training and reduced workloads are effective in helping caseworkers in ADC, and to whether the workers and recipients would be receptive to such an extension of service.

Juvenile Delinquency: Its Nature and Control, by Sophia M. Robison. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1960. 546 pp. \$6.75. (Reviewed in CHILD WELFARE, Oct. 1960.)

The Pastor and Community Resources, by Charles F. Kemp, National Council of Churches of Christ in the U. S. A., N. Y. The Bethany Press, St. Louis, Mo. 96 pp. \$1.50. A manual for the pastor, designed to provide information about the pastor's relationship with social agencies and an index of local resources and national agencies.

The Professional Houseparent, by Eva Burmeister. Columbia University Press, N. Y., 1960. 244 pp. \$4.00. (Excerpt appeared in CHILD WELFARE, March 1960.)

Recommendations: Composite Report of Forum Findings, 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., 1960. 85 pp. 35¢.

The Self-Image of the Foster Child, by Eugene A. Weinstein. Russell Sage Foundation, N. Y., 1960. 80 pp. \$2.00. (Reviewed in CHILD WELFARE, Dec., 1960.)

ELLA ELSTEIN
Librarian

CORRECTION

In the editorial in the November issue, page 8, par. 3, column 2, line 3 should have read, "opposing the Louisiana type legislation . . ."

CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL OPENINGS

Classified personnel advertisements are inserted at the rate of 15 cents per word; boxed ads \$7.50 per inch; minimum insertion \$3.00. Deadline for acceptance or cancellation of ads is **sixth** of month preceding month of publication. Ads listing box numbers or otherwise not identifying the agency are accepted only when accompanied by statement that person currently holding the job knows ad is being placed.

CASEWORKERS—Several immediate openings for mature, flexible, competent persons. Challenging work situation. Required: MSW, with or without experience in child or family welfare agency. Salary related to applicant's qualifications. Fringe benefits. Write: The Adoption Institute, 1026 S. Spaulding Ave., Los Angeles 19, Calif.

child placement in foster home care and group care, psychiatric consultation. Highly qualified supervision. Standard personnel practices. Opportunities for advancement. Salary, \$5400-\$7548 depending on training and experience. Write: Rev. William J. Barry, Assistant Director, Catholic Welfare Bureau, 855 S. Figueroa St., Los Angeles 17, Calif.

graduate study. Alameda County Civil Service, 188-12th St., Oakland, Calif.

SUPERINTENDENT OF SOCIAL SERVICE position with immediate responsibility for organization and administration of all county public welfare programs. Requires 2 years' graduate study in social work or MSW and 6 years' supervisory or administrative experience in a social work capacity 2 years of which must have been in a public welfare agency. Salary \$10,284-\$12,852. Contact San Mateo County Civil Service Commission, Court House, Redwood City, Calif.

LOS ANGELES—Openings for two caseworkers with graduate training in expanding family and child welfare agency—multiple services including marital counseling, unmarried parents, financial assistance,

SAN FRANCISCO Bay Area public welfare agency has openings for trained workers. All child welfare services. Psychiatric consultation. \$6060-\$7356. Requires 2 years'

SOCIAL WORK SUPERVISOR III, OPTION I, position supervising adult section including OAS, blind, disabled and general assistance recipients and responsibility for administration of vocational services program. Requires MSW and 6 years' social service experience, 2 years of which must have been in supervisory work. Salary \$8132-\$10,284. Contact San Mateo County Civil Service Commission, Court House, Redwood City, Calif.

CHILD WELFARE SERVICES WORKERS for Southern California county. Opportunities in adoption included. Worker II (\$5718-\$6900) requires year's graduate study in social work and 2 years' experience or 2 years' graduate study. Worker I (\$5142-\$6192) requires 1 year's graduate study in social work. Paid vacation and sick leave, part-paid health insurance, liberal retirement benefits. County Personnel, Court-house, San Bernardino, Calif.

CHILD WELFARE WORKERS II \$6024-\$7320 for family and children's work. Santa Clara County Welfare Department. Progressive agency in fast growing metropolitan area south of San Francisco Bay. Fine climate. Liberal benefits. MSW preferred. Also **CHILD WELFARE WORKER I** \$5460-\$6635. One year's graduate training. Also, **SOCIAL WORKER II** \$5196-\$6324. AB and 1 year of social work experience. Write: Mrs. Virginia Sachs, Staff Development Officer, 45 W. St. James St., San Jose, Calif.

CASEWORK SPECIALIST, male, for residential treatment unit for boys. Psychiatric orientation. Responsibilities include work with children, parents, residential staff, psychiatrists, psychologists, and teachers. Prefer experienced worker. MSW from accredited school of social work required. Retirement plan, Social Security coverage, good personnel practices, health insurance, member CWLA. Salary commensurate with training and experience. Vista Del Mar Child - Care Service, 3200 Motor Ave., Los Angeles 34, Calif.

CASEWORKER II or III for multiple-function child placement agency to be responsible for cottage placed children and their families. Psychiatric orientation, excellent supervision, MSW required. Retirement plan, Social Security and good personnel practices, health insurance, member CWLA. Salary: Caseworker II, \$450-\$563; Caseworker III, \$503-\$629. Vista Del Mar Child-Care Service, 3200 Motor Ave., Los Angeles 34, Calif.

tions, 35 hour week, 4 weeks vacation. Liberal sick leave, car furnished where needed, all expenses paid on agency business. Opportunity for advancement. Required: 2 years social work school and 2 years of full-time professional employment in family or child welfare agency. \$4950-\$6440. Can appoint at \$5546. Good State retirement plan integrated with Social Security. Miss E. Kathryn Pennypacker, Chief, Bureau of Social Services, State Department of Public Welfare, Box 309, Wilmington 99, Dela.

ADOPTION WORKER needed for progressive, growing, southeast Florida community. Salary commensurate with experience. Full training required, adoption experience desirable. For details write Miss Margaret G. Muller, State Director of Services, Childrens Home Society of Florida, P.O. Box 5587, Jacksonville 7, Fla.

SUPERVISOR of district office located in Norwalk, Conn. Staff of 3 fully-trained, experienced caseworkers. A private, statewide, multiple-service agency offering family service, foster home care and services to unmarried mothers in this office. Adoption placement and residential treatment service for emotionally disturbed children available within agency. Excellent personnel practices. Salary range \$6000-\$8100. Initial salary dependent on experience. Requirements: Master's degree in social work with at least 3 years' experience in supervision. Apply to C. Rollin Zane, Executive Director, Children's Services of Connecticut, 1680 Albany Ave., Hartford 5, Conn.

SUPERVISOR OF CASEWORK: Family and Child Care Agency—Qualifications include professional education and experience in casework practice and supervision of qualified staff with psychiatric consultation. Agency functions: family casework, foster care of children, service to unwed parents and adoption. The responsibilities include directing casework services and student program with related community and administrative activities. Salary commensurate with good practice and current standards. Social Security and retirement benefits. For further details of position write: Miss Jane K. Dewell, District Secretary, The Diocesan Bureau of Social Service, 478 Orange St., New Haven 2, Conn.

CASE SUPERVISOR—Supervise staff of workers in public assistance or child welfare services in rural county. Pleasant working condi-

CASEWORKER MSW and experience necessary with older treatment-agency, recent girls units. Imp of facilities cents cont Immediate Alton M. Apply The for Girls, cago 4, Ill.

EARLY CHILD WORKER \$6500 acc diversified personnel practices. Retirement and CWLA. Additions. W. rector, Faculty, 313 S.

CASEWORKER nning Oct. MSW. Sta Can appear service C. work studi City, Chicat. Cath 673 Broad

CAMPUS (male) in 45 depen disturbed ch gressive p. psycholog consultation, activities for adm munity groups. desirable required. pending campus Write I. dren's H. A. Road

SUPERVISOR and chil counseling and hom agency \$7200-\$8200 qualificatio Executive Children Ave., Fo

CATHO male, 1 required Cosgrove Davenpe

vacation
for furniture
expenses
Opportunities
Required:
and 2
al em-
welfare
point
ment
Secu-
racker,
rvices,
Wel-
Dela.

ed for
the east
com-
Full
experi-
write
State
Childrens
. Box

Community
Gold
unction
mediate
option
actices.
r ad-
pro-
\$5800
ather
elfare
Miami

for
ency,
work,
the ex-
\$800-
n. of
St.,

home
home
posi-
serv-
ected
MA
main-
28
é de
ences
ation,
Ga.

36]

CASEWORKER SUPERVISOR. MSW and substantial casework experience required. Supervisory ability necessary. Experience in work with older children desired. For a treatment-oriented group care agency, serving disturbed adolescent girls in 2 small residential units. Improvement and expansion of facilities and services to adolescents contemplated. Salary, \$9000. Immediate opening. New executive Alton M. Brotén, coming Jan. 15. Apply The Mary Bartelme Home for Girls, 327 S. LaSalle St., Chicago 4, Ill.

EARLY OPENINGS for CASEWORKERS MSW beginning \$4800-\$6500 according to experience. Small diversified case load. Advanced personnel practices. Social Security and Retirement. Agency member FSAA and CWLA. Pleasant working conditions. Write Luna E. Kenney, Director, Family and Children's Service, 313 S.E. 2nd, Evansville, Ind.

CASEWORKER: Vacancy beginning October 1st for person with MSW. Starting salary \$5400-\$6000. Can appoint at \$6000. Multiple-service Catholic agency has field work students from Loyola University, Chicago. Psychiatric consultation. Catholic Social Service Bureau, 673 Broadway, Gary, Ind.

CAMPUS LIFE DIRECTOR (male) in small institution serving 45 dependent or somewhat disturbed children of school age. Progressive program includes casework, psychological tests, psychiatric consultation, tutoring, supervision of activities of children, opportunity for administrative training, community liaison in sponsoring groups. Experience in group care desirable. Appropriate A.B. degree required. Salary \$4000-\$5000 depending on qualifications, plus campus housing. Opening now. Write Indiana Methodist Children's Home, Lebanon, Ind., John A. Roadley, Administrator.

SUPERVISOR in private family and children's agency providing counseling, foster care, adoption and homemaker service. Member agency CWLA and FSAA. Salary \$7200-\$10,200 dependent upon qualifications. Write Leon D. Fisher, Executive Director, Family and Children's Service, 2424 Fairfield Ave., Fort Wayne, Ind.

CATHOLIC CASEWORKER, female, 1 year of graduate training required. Apply, Catholic Charities, Cosgrove Bldg., 410 Brady St., Davenport, Iowa.

CHILD WELFARE · December, 1960

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS—CAREER CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS—Several social workers with at least one year of professional training and some experience are needed to work with families and children on Indian reservation in the West and the Middle West. Vacancies also in Alaska. Colorful environment, varied activities, opportunities for use of initiative and resourcefulness, and good opportunities for promotion. Most positions start at \$6435; some higher; 25% additional cost of living allowance for Alaska. Write to Branch of Welfare, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington 25, D.C., for application or additional information.

and chronic services, tuberculosis hospital, nursing home, services to the aging. Out-Patient Department and In-Patient Service in all departments. Requires successful completion of 2 years' graduate study in professional school of social work which included special training in group work. Salary range \$5340-\$6468 over 5 year period. Social Security and retirement plan. Write: Miss Mazie F. Rappaport, Director Social Service Department, Baltimore City Hospitals, Baltimore 24, Md.

CASEWORKERS. In children's division of multiple-function agency, in program for emotionally disturbed children in foster family care. Work closely with consulting psychiatrist and carry small case load of 12-15 children. Excellent personnel practices. MSW required. Salary \$4500-\$6400 depending on experience. Clark L. Mock, Executive Director, Family and Children's Society, 204 W. Lanvale St., Baltimore 17, Md.

MEDICAL SOCIAL CASEWORKER in large municipal hospital with active teaching and research program. Social Service Department newly established. Acute and chronic services, tuberculosis hospital, nursing home, services to the aging. Out-Patient Department and In-Patient Service in all departments. Require successful completion of 2 years' graduate study in professional school of social work. Salary range: \$5340-\$6468 over 5 year period. Social Security and retirement plan. Write: Miss Mazie F. Rappaport, Director, Social Service Department, Baltimore City Hospitals, Baltimore 24, Md.

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERVISOR of medical social work. New supervisory position in newly established hospital social service department. Large municipal hospital with active teaching and research program. Acute and chronic services, tuberculosis hospital, nursing home, services to the aging. Out-Patient Department and In-Patient Service in all departments. Require successful completion of 2 years' graduate study in professional school of social work; 5 years' experience, including 3 years' supervisory experience. Salary range: \$7104-\$8640 over 5 year period. Social Security and retirement plan. Write: Miss

Mazie F. Rappaport, Director, Social Service Department, Baltimore City Hospitals, Baltimore 24, Md.

CASEWORKERS: Psychiatrically oriented. Statewide child protective agency CWLA member with excellent personnel practices, supervision, psychiatric consultation. Prefer experienced caseworkers, but will consider beginners with MS degree. NASW starting salary (\$5400-\$7000 in 5 years) as of January 1, 1961. Rare opportunity for preventive, outgoing casework with multi-problem disordered families. Vacancies in several Massachusetts communities. Write to Robert M. Mulford, General Secretary, Massachusetts SPCC, 43 Mt. Vernon St., Boston 8, Mass.

CASEWORKER. Agency increasing staff, better to serve community of 100,000, contiguous to Boston, with family casework, child placement, maternity and adoptive service. MSW required. Minimum salary \$5000. Psychiatric consultation. Contact Somerville Catholic Charities, 190 Highland Ave., Somerville, Mass.

CASEWORKER, Female. Adoption department of CWLA member multiple-service agency. Interracial. Work with unmarried mothers, placement and supervision of children in foster and adoptive homes. MSW required. Salary range \$4950-\$6650. Starting salary based on qualifications. Excellent personnel practices. Offices located at beautiful Children's Village. Write William L. Wilson, Director of Social Services, Methodist Children's Home Society, 26645 West Six Mile Rd., Detroit 40, Mich.

CASEWORKER. Family and child welfare agency. Master's degree required. Salary range \$5200-\$6500 depending on experience. Man or woman. Catholic Social Service Bureau, 200 E. Kearsley St., Flint 2, Mich.

CASEWORKER, mainly for our institutional program serving children 5 to 17. Require MSW. This is a multiple-service agency located in western Michigan recreation area. Salary \$5400. M. S. Bier, Muskegon Children's Home, 1352 Terrace St., Muskegon, Mich.

CASEWORKER. City of St. Louis, Missouri. MSW required. Experience preferred in adoption and in-take service in children's agency. Salary range \$4365-\$6140 depending on qualifications. Liberal civil service fringe benefits. Department

of Personnel, City of St. Louis, 235 Municipal Courts Bldg., St. Louis 3, Mo.

NEVADA STATE WELFARE DEPARTMENT has opening for District Director II, \$464-\$562 (Ely). Graduate work required with some substitution for experience. Appointment may be above the minimum step depending upon qualifications. Residence waived. U. S. citizenship required. For particulars write Nevada State Welfare Department, State Capitol, Carson City, Nev.

MERGER of 2 children's agencies offers new and creative opportunities. Both beginning and experienced caseworkers needed. Salary range related to specialized responsibility. Easy commuting from New York City. Miss Leontine Young, Executive Secretary, Children's Aid and Foster Home, 507 Orange St., Newark 7, N. J.

CASEWORKER, for child protective service, in well-established family agency, 15 miles from New York City. Aggressive casework with multi-problem families, much contact with community facilities. Also home finding to provide temporary foster care. Graduate of a school of social work required, salary range \$4800-\$6600 with \$300 increments. Can appoint up to \$6000. Liberal personnel practices. Write to Stanley Glickman, Executive Director, Family and Children's Service, 439 Main St., Orange, N. J.

SUPERVISOR for child protective service in a well-established family agency. Responsibilities include supervision of 1 or 2 caseworkers, 2 Junior League volunteers, also limited case load. Aggressive casework program with multi-problem families, and foster care for neglected children temporarily needing placement. Considerable emphasis on work with schools, courts, and other community facilities. Master's degree in social work required, experience in casework and supervision. Agency is FSAA member, considering CWLA membership, located 15 miles from New York City. Salary up to \$7000 to start, regular increments, good personnel practices. Write Stanley Glickman, Executive Director, The Family and Children's Service of the Oranges and Maplewood, 439 Main St., Orange, N. J.

ADOPTION WORKER— New and expanding Catholic agency. Excellent opportunity for experienced child welfare worker with ability to work independently to help develop new adoption and foster home finding program. Applicants must have completed graduate training from an accredited school of social work and must have a minimum of 4 years of experience. Can appoint at \$6000. Kate Curran, Director, Catholic Family Service, Box 1290, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

CASEWORKER, MSW. Small interracial, nonsectarian, group care agency, 36 children ages 6-12, needs 2 social workers—one male, one female. Intramural and extramural school facilities, analytically oriented child psychiatrist and psychologist provide consultation to clinical services department. New physical plant and changing program afford a challenge to any creative and dynamic individual. Primary function direct therapy with children. Salary \$5500-\$7200. Can appoint to \$6300. Contact Edwin Millard, Executive Director, Albany Home for Children, 60 Academy Rd., Albany, N. Y.

NEEDED by multi-functional children's agency: 1 psychiatric caseworker for psychiatric clinic, 1 foster home caseworker, and 2 caseworkers for child protection department. All must be graduates of a professional school, preferably with several years of experience in related fields. Apply: E. Marguerite Gane, Executive Secretary, Children's Aid and SPCC, 330 Delaware Ave., Buffalo 2, N. Y.

CHILDREN'S VILLAGE. Residential treatment school for emotionally disturbed boys, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y. Psychiatric caseworker responsible for intensive casework treatment and interpretation to milieu staff. Weekly clinic consultations with psychiatrist, dynamic supervision, weekly training seminars, opportunities for promotion. MSW. Salary scale \$5000-\$7850.

CLINICAL SUPERVISOR. Administrative and training responsibility for clinical unit consisting of 4 psychiatric caseworkers, psychiatric consultant and psychologist. MSW. Experience in supervision and clinical treatment required. Salary scale \$6750-\$8000. Mrs. Dorothy Orr, Director of Child Guidance Services.

CASEW...
SOR (C...
CASEW...
\$6500),
experi...
program...
home p...
care in...
tion. A...
services...
Mackre...
Service,...
Childre...
Forest

CASEW...
dren's age...
MSW requi...
offering m...
care, ado...
ages, psyc...
perience p...
\$6250 bas...
to Mrs. K...
rector El...
Service, F...
N. Y.

TRAINEE...
variety of...
ent couns...
foster ho...
tionally d...
chiatric t...
with lead...
portunities...
ment. Sal...
\$5200-\$6...
ceptional...
increments...
stantial h...
Miss Eli...
Director,...
Children'...
St., New

PSYCHIATRIST...
Catholic...
guidance...
children...
agency. I...
adolesce...
pendent...
ifications...
R. Joyce...
Hygiene...
York Fo...
Ave., N...
9-2200.

CASEW...
married...
ing care,...
program...
home, ...
of child...
Write

CASEWORK SUPERVISOR (\$6800-\$7500) and **CASEWORKER** (\$5000-\$6500), fully trained and experienced for child care program providing foster home placement and group care in cottage type institution. Auxiliary professional services. Write to Robert W. Mackreth, Director of Social Service, Brooklyn Home for Children, 67-35 112th St., Forest Hills 75, N. Y.

CASEWORKER, family and children's agency, diversified case load, MSW required, interesting program offering marriage counseling, child care, adoption, counseling to all ages, psychiatric consultation. Experience preferable. Salary \$5200-\$6250 based on experience. Write to Mrs. Katharine Westwood, Director Elmira Child and Family Service, Federation Bldg., Elmira, N. Y.

TRAINED CASEWORKER for variety of services to children. Parent counseling, homemaker service, foster home care, work with emotionally disturbed children in psychiatric treatment. Staff seminars with leaders in child welfare. Opportunities for professional advancement. Salary regular caseworker \$5200-\$6600. Caseworker with exceptional skill \$6600-\$7770. Annual increments 5% of salary. Substantial health and pension benefits. Miss Elizabeth Stringer, Assistant Director, Foster Care Services, The Children's Aid Society, 150 E. 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.

PSYCHIATRIC CASEWORKER, Catholic: Immediate opening in guidance clinic primarily servicing children in Catholic foster care agency. Direct work with children, adolescents and adults. Salary dependent upon experience and qualifications. MSW required. Alfred R. Joyce, M.D., Director, Mental Hygiene and Guidance Clinic, New York Foundling Hospital, 1175 3rd Ave., New York 21, N. Y. TR 9-2200.

CASEWORKER—Services to unmarried parents, temporary boarding care, adoption. Total intramural program including own maternity home, psychiatric panel, adoption of children with special needs, etc. Write for agency brochure and

technical papers. MSW required. Salary range \$5000-\$7080; increase 2/1/61 to \$5200-\$7540. Carl Schoenberg, Louise Wise Services, 10-12 E. 94th St., New York 28, N. Y.

INSTITUTIONAL DIRECTORS and house parents. We specialize in the placement of administrative personnel for child care institutions. **GERTRUDE R. STEIN, INC.**, Vocational Service Agency, 64 W. 48th St., New York City.

CASEWORKER, professionally trained, in young rapidly growing child-care agency. Salary scale \$5200-\$6800. Excellent supervision and psychiatric consultation, student training program. Write Miss Merle E. MacMahon, Windham Children's Service, 80 Fifth Ave., New York 11.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT for private, nonsectarian agency offering service to unmarried parents and adoption. Agency operates small group home in new, specially designed building in suburban area. Requirements: MSW, with supervisory or administrative experience; salary range \$6000-\$7500. Write to Mrs. Frances F. Titus, Director, Rochester Maternal and Adoption Service, Inc., 160 Northaven Terrace, Rochester 21, N. Y.

CASEWORKERS, male and female. Positions available in multi-function children's agency. Regular psychiatric consultation. Social Security and retirement. MSW required. Starting salary at the rate of \$5400 per year. CWLA member. Miss Adelaide Kaiser, Director, Hillside Children's Center, 1183 Monroe Ave., Rochester 20, N. Y.

SENIOR CASEWORKER, graduate accredited school. Experienced in children's field preferred. For intake service in children's foster home agency. Services include psychiatric, remedial reading, psychological. Excellent supervision and personnel practices. Salary range \$6000-\$7250, commensurate with experience. Write or phone: Miss Virginia M. Whalen, Society for Seamen's Children, 26 Bay St., Staten Island 1, N. Y., GI 7-7740.

PSYCHOLOGIST, male, to join our staff as we develop a residential treatment program for 24 children. Diagnostic responsibility and therapy with children and parents. Psy-

chiatric supervision. Previous clinical experience desired. Beautiful suburban setting. Excellent salary to qualified person. D. M. DeMuth, Executive Director, Beech Brook Children's Home, 3737 Lander Rd., Cleveland 24, Ohio.

GROUP WORKER, MA. We want an experienced, creative group worker who is interested in getting in on the ground floor in the development of a residential treatment program for 24 children. Consultative arrangement possible but person should be able to operate fairly independently. Beautiful suburban setting. Excellent salary to the right person. D. M. DeMuth, Executive Director, Beech Brook Children's Home, 3737 Lander Rd., Cleveland 24, Ohio.

CASEWORKER, female. In agency with primary emphasis on service for troubled adolescent boys and girls, most of whom live in their own homes. Service for parents in relation to problems of their adolescents. Majority of applications received direct from parents. Strong community support of program; close cooperation with other agencies; budget from United Appeal. Prefer worker with some experience in family or children's agency or psychiatric clinic. Appropriate supervision for beginning or experienced worker. Salary \$5040-\$8400; initial salary based on qualifications. Elizabeth B. Noyes, Executive Director, Youth Service, 1001 Huron Rd., Cleveland 15, Ohio.

DIRECTOR OF CASE-WORK. In private agency serving adolescents. Most of clients in own homes; some in foster homes and in agency-operated group home. Trained professional staff of 14 caseworkers. Applicant must have sound knowledge of casework theory as well as extensive and intensive experience in casework practice. Ability to take leadership role in staff training and program development is essential. Majority of staff with considerable skill and experience; active in study of performance and of ways to improve quality of service to adolescents. Miss Elizabeth B. Noyes, Executive Director, Youth Service, 1001 Huron Rd., Cleveland 15, Ohio.

**FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S BUREAU
COLUMBUS, OHIO**

CASEWORKERS with MSW for a beginning and an advanced casework position in a family-centered casework program. Home-makers service, child care and adoptions are included. Self-reliant professional practice is emphasized. For details of these positions and agency program, write to Ralph C. Bennett, Family and Children's Bureau, 248 South High St., Columbus 15, Ohio.

ADOPTION SUPERVISOR in large multiple-service children's agency, psychiatric consultation, in-service training, supervision. Excellent public retirement plan. Require MS and 4 years' experience in child welfare. Salary based on qualifications. CASEWORKERS I and II in child placing and home-finding. Opportunity to improve on job through above listed media and seminars. Apply Director, Child Welfare Division, 2505 Cedar Ave., Cleveland 15, Ohio.

CASEWORKERS AND SUPERVISORS with professional training needed for public child welfare agency. Standard personnel practices and salaries, developing program. GROUP WORKER, MSW, for campus activities program. Richard Allaman, Executive Secretary, Montgomery County Child Welfare Board (Shawen Acres), 3304 N. Main St., Dayton 5, Ohio.

OPPORTUNITY for supervisor-senior caseworker interested in intake and family counseling. Agency with FSAA and CWLA memberships, offers flexible, expanding program, bright new facilities, good personnel policies. Salary range up to \$8000. Write Howard Hush, Family and Children's Service Association, 184 Salem Ave., Dayton 6, Ohio.

SOUTHERN OREGON CALLING experienced caseworker-therapist, with family service or family counseling background. Expanding guidance clinic serving county of 75,000 in mild, dry Rogue River Valley; 1½ hours to Crater Lake; 2 hours to Mt. Shasta. Diversified treatment load, plus community consultation-education, and help shape clinic program. Self-direction and informality prevail. \$6900 start. Write for brochures and information. Dr. A. E. Merkel, Director, Guidance Clinic, Courthouse, Medford, Ore.

ADOPTION CASEWORKER. A Catholic child placement agency providing adoption, a foster boarding home program, and service to unmarried mothers. MSW required. Salary based on experience. Apply to Rev. Morton E. Park, Director, Catholic Services for Children, 400 Dekum Bldg., Portland 4, Ore.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR. Immediate opportunity to presently exercise your experience in a small family and children's agency away from the tension of city life in a friendly cultural atmosphere close to mountains and lakes in south central Pennsylvania. MSW required in lieu of considerable experience in this field. Program includes adoptions, counseling. Salary range comparable with good agency practice. Reply confidential. Family and Children's Services, Kronenberg Bldg., Carlisle, Pa.

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (male) Dynamic position in home serving emotionally disturbed children who attend public school. Capable of handling children, particularly teenagers, working with staff, supervising daily living. Three years here could lead to any executive position. Salary \$3600-\$4400 plus maintenance (equivalent to \$2500), equals \$6200-\$6900. CASEWORKER also wanted. Write Leonard Yaffe, Children's Home, 25th St. and Lehigh Dr., Easton, Pa.

CASEWORKER: Parent counseling in private residential school treatment program for multiply-

handicapped children located near Philadelphia. Opportunity for fascinating collaborative work on behalf of children presenting complicated diagnostic and treatment problems. Direct work with children also available. Participation in research and proposed student training program also possible. Required: MSW. Can hire at \$5500. Good personnel practices with optional maintenance. Alexander Hersh, Chief Social Service, The Woods Schools, Langhorne, Pa.

CASEWORKER: Male or female, MSW, for new, additional staff position in vigorous, growing agency. Case load can include varied range of family and children's problems and opportunity to exercise initiative. Regular, excellent psychiatric consultation. Emphasis on pioneering in new methods within a multiple-function agency, well accepted by community. Good supervision, progressive personnel, retirement practices. Blue Cross, Blue Shield available. New attractive offices. Salary scale \$4600-\$6800. Can appoint above minimum depending on qualifications. Pleasant small community in Pennsylvania Dutch country. Write Miss Evalyn M. Strickler, Executive Secretary, Family and Children's Service, 937 Willow St., Lebanon, Pa.

CASEWORKER, MSW with experience, for newly created position in family counseling service of the Children's Aid Society of Montgomery County, Pa. Position open October 1, 1960. Professional staff; experienced supervision. Psychiatric consultation. Good personnel practices. Salary range \$5000-\$6000. Pleasant suburban community, adjacent to Philadelphia. Write Miss Sarah M. Anthony, Children's Aid Society of Montgomery County, 17 W. Airy St., Norristown, Pa.

CASEWORKERS for children's agency offering counseling to unmarried mothers, foster care and adoption service. Excellent supervision. Psychiatric consultation, student training program, research program, retirement and major medical insurance. Required: MSW. \$4900-\$6900. Starting salary based on experience. Dr. Elizabeth A. Lawder, Executive Director, Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania, 311 S. Juniper St., Philadelphia 7, Pa.

SUPERVISOR offering care for mothers, for service. Student training program, medical ins. \$6500-\$8500. Experie. Lawder, Children's Aid 311 S. Juniper St., Pa.

SUPERVISOR partment still expands offers insti- tion, service. Small case- ment and within age. \$6900-\$8100. Taylor, Es- sication to Spencer S.

CASEWORKER Commun- negle- ing in as salary \$5000-\$6000. experience. retirement E. Will- Avenue 1. Termon

CASEWORKER those who in a mul- progressive program which in- dividual agency range \$5000-\$6000. salary \$5000-\$6000. require- cial work- man. Fa- 808 Hous- Pittsbur-

CASEWORKER related care for children active pro- ings in area. Va.

near
fas-
on
com-
ment
chil-
ation
ident
sible.
e at
ctices
exan-
service,
e, Pa.

male,
posi-
ency.
range
blems
initia-
tratic
neer-
multi-
cepted
sion,
ment
shield
ffices.
ap-
ding
small
utch
M.
Fam-
937

xpe-
ition
the
cont-
open
staff;
chiat-
onnel
0000.
ad-
Miss
Aid
, 17

ren's
un-
and
per-
stu-
arch
major
SW.
ased
A.
Chil-
ania,
ia 7,

SUPERVISOR for children's agency offering counseling to unmarried mothers, foster care and adoption service. Psychiatric consultation, student training program, research program, retirement and major medical insurance. Required: MSW. \$6500-\$8500. Starting salary based on experience. Dr. Elizabeth A. Lawder, Executive Director, Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania, 311 S. Juniper St., Philadelphia 7, Pa.

to participate in many phases of child placement. Starting salary in line with area average based on experience. Room and board provided, if desired, for single worker—plus many other benefits. Write: Rev. Garnet O. Adams, Superintendent, Bethany Children's Home, Womelsdorf, Pa.

CASEWORK PRACTITIONER
WANTED: Marriage counselor, MSW, to work in modern progressive family counseling program. FSSA member, consultative type supervision. Psychiatric and psychological consultation. Active and progressive board. Excellent job setting, flexible hours, starting salary \$6300. Mrs. Emma Joe Hill, Family Counseling Service, 312 Adams Bldg., Port Arthur, Texas.

CASEWORKER: MSW diversified or specialized caseload. Salary \$5500-\$8000. 4 weeks vacation, 9 holidays, $7\frac{1}{2}$ hour day. N.H.W. retirement. Paid insurance—Social Security—Interview and moving expenses. Beautiful community. Call collect or write: B. R. O'Brien, Executive Director, Family Service and Children's Aid Society, 212 Liberty St., Warren, Pa.

SUPERVISOR—Foster home department in well established but still expanding agency which also offers institutional treatment, adoption, services to unmarried mothers. Small case loads, psychiatric treatment and psychological services within agency permit careful work. \$6900-\$8100. Apply Joseph L. Taylor, Executive Director, Association for Jewish Children, 1301 Spencer St., Philadelphia 41, Pa.

CASEWORKER for small private Community Chest aided home for neglected and dependent girls ranging in age from 6-17. Beginning salary \$5000-\$6000 depending on experience. Social Security and Retirement benefits. Contact Dorothy E. Williams, Director Termon Avenue Home for Children, 2051 Termon Ave., Pittsburgh 12, Pa.

CASEWORKERS. Openings for those who are interested in work in a multiple-function agency in a progressive metropolitan area. A program of staff development which includes opportunities for individual professional growth within agency and community. Salary range \$4800-\$8300. Appointment salary based on experience. Requirement: master's degree in social work. Write: Mary Ellen Hoffman, Family and Childrens Service, 808 House Bldg., 4 Smithfield St., Pittsburgh 22, Pa.

CASEWORKER: For church-related children's home providing care for 180 dependent-neglected children. Cottage type home with active program. Beautiful surroundings in country near metropolitan area. Varied program. Opportunity

CHIEF PSYCHIATRIC SOCIAL WORKER orthopsychiatrically oriented mental hygiene clinic, in beautiful sea coast community 20 miles from Norfolk. Duties may include student supervision. Required: MSW and 4 years of casework experience, 2 of which must have been in a psychiatric setting. Range: \$5640-\$7032. Contact: Patricia R. Pearce, M.D., Director-Psychiatrist, Atlantic Mental Hygiene Center, 207 17th St., Virginia Beach, Va.

PSYCHIATRIC SOCIAL WORKER. Community guidance center for children up to 18 years currently being organized under private administration, supported by tax monies, has opening for psychiatric social worker to form team with psychiatrist and clinical psychologist. Fine opportunity for initiative in developing agency in progressive, growing, highly stable college community. Minimum requirements: MSW from accredited school, at least 2 years' supervised experience in psychiatric setting following master's training and an additional year of supervisory, consultative or administrative experience in social work, chiefly with children. Salary according to qualifications and experience. David B. Bliss, President, Community Guidance Center Board, P.O. Box 203, Appleton, Wisc.

CASEWORKER, male or female. For dynamically oriented residential center located 30 miles from Milwaukee, 22 boys, housed in 2 separate living units. Intensive treatment, case load of 8-12 boys, some casework with parents. Join professional staff of director, cottage supervisor, caseworker, group worker. Child care staff of 12. Weekly psychoanalytic consultation with 2 child psychiatrists. Future opportunity for supervision. Excellent salary for skilled therapist. Ralph Sherman, Executive Director, Lad Lake, Dousman, Wisc.

CASEWORKER for program providing foster home care to disturbed children, casework to children in own homes, and adoptive placement. MA required. Beginning salary \$5600-\$6900 depending upon experience. Excellent consultation resources, personnel policies, and benefits. Private, nonsectarian agency. One opening in Milwaukee and one in Racine. Charles Leopold, Children's Service Society of Wisconsin, 610 N. Jackson St., Milwaukee, Wisc.

CASEWORKER for newly merged family and children's agency. Two openings. MSW required. Experience in child or family casework preferred. Agency is a member of CWLA. Excellent personnel practices and working conditions. Psychiatric consultation available. Salary range \$5640-\$8040, depending upon experience. Apply Reverend Edward E. Carroll, Catholic Social Welfare Bureau, 207 E. Michigan St., Milwaukee 2, Wisc.

The University of Michigan
General Library - Order Dept.
Ann Arbor, Mich.

6

Announcing . . .

TWO IMPORTANT NEW PAMPHLETS ON THE EDUCATION OF COTTAGE PARENTS

Cottage Parents: What They Have to Be, Know and Do

by HYMAN GROSSBARD, Associate Professor, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University.

The title is an accurate summary of the content of the pamphlet. The author writes from a background of broad experience and deep concern for cottage parents and their education.

1-22 29 pages, \$85

Training Courses for Cottage Parents in Children's Institutions Report of a conference

The proceedings of the meeting held at the Child Welfare League of America early this year for those engaged in training of houseparents. The report includes a detailed description of current training courses, and a discussion of teaching methods and future plans.

1-23 23 pages, \$75

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

345 East 46th Street • New York 17, N. Y.

Please send:

..... copies of ***Cottage Parents: What They Have to Be, Know and Do***
1-22 \$85

..... copies of ***Training Courses for Cottage Parents in Children's Institutions*** 1-23 \$75

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

1169

CITY _____

ZONE _____ STATE _____

Pamphlets, mimeographed booklets, and special reports published by the Child Welfare League may be had in quantities of 10 or more copies at 10% less than the listed cost.

All orders under \$2 must be accompanied by cash, money order, check or stamps. Please add 10% to cover postage and handling.

FIT OF
OSTAG
ID
k, N.
No. 78

y.

back-

, 8.85

ar for
urrent

s, 8.75

may be